United Nations

A/62/PV.60

General Assembly

Sixty-second session

Official Records

60th plenary meeting

Friday, 30 November 2007, 3 p.m.

New York

President: Mr. Kerim . . . . (The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia)

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Agenda item 17

The situation in the Middle East

Reports of the Secretary-General (A/62/327 and A/62/344)

Draft resolutions (A/62/L.22 and A/62/L.23)

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Egypt to introduce draft resolutions A/62/L.22 and A/62/L.23.

Mr. Abdelaziz (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): The General Assembly is meeting today to consider agenda item 17, entitled "The situation in the Middle East", which aims at enhancing international engagement in the Arab-Israeli conflict, a conflict resulting from Israel's ongoing occupation of Arab territories since 1967 and its catastrophic practices in those lands.

It is a source of optimism that our debate on this item coincides with a new international approach to address the Arab-Israeli conflict more seriously and attentively, namely, the holding of the Annapolis Conference, which represented a first step on the way forward to resume Arab-Israeli peace negotiations, especially on the Palestinian-Israeli track, in order to reach a just and lasting solution to the question of Palestine, the core of the Middle East conflict.

This development comes after Arab delegations reiterated, from this podium and in all other international forums, their steadfast commitment to the just and comprehensive peace reflected in the Arab Peace Initiative of 2002, which was reaffirmed in 2007. That requires action by the international community as represented in the General Assembly to generate support for final-status negotiations on the Palestinian track leading to the achievement of a just, comprehensive and lasting settlement to the Arab-Israeli conflict on all tracks, on the basis of the principle of land for peace and the relevant resolutions of the United Nations.

In order to express the international community's opposition to Israel's continuing illegal occupation of Arab territories and its firm belief in the need to end the occupation as soon as possible, every year at this time the General Assembly adopts two draft resolutions of great importance under the agenda item "The situation in the Middle East". The first pertains to the question of Jerusalem. Relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions have reaffirmed the need to preserve the special status of that city, as well as the illegitimacy of any measures undertaken by successive Israeli Governments to alter its character prior to the conclusion of final status negotiations and the establishment of an independent, sovereign and viable Palestinian state. The second draft resolution deals with the occupied Syrian Golan and reiterates the will and determination of the international community to end Israel's forcible occupation of Syrian territory and to achieve its full withdrawal to the borders of 4 June 1967.

Undoubtedly, the convening of the Annapolis Conference, in which all Arab parties concerned,

---

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

including Syria, participated and the agreement to launch negotiations on the Palestinian track aimed at the establishment of an independent and viable Palestinian state, with East Jerusalem as its capital, before the end of 2008 under a specific time frame that takes into consideration all relevant elements — including United Nations resolutions, the Arab Peace Initiative and the Road Map — will foster an international environment conducive to achieving a settlement through Israel's withdrawal from all Arab territories occupied in 1967, including East Jerusalem, Lebanon's Shab'a farms and the Syrian Golan Heights. That would lead to the achievement of just and comprehensive peace to ensure the stability of the Middle East in a context that assures the establishment of an independent Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza within the borders of 1967 and the establishment of normal peaceful relations between Arabs and Israel.

This is the letter and spirit of the Arab Peace Initiative, which is based on the idea of full withdrawal in return for full peace, which we look forward to achieving before the end of 2008. For this to succeed, international support through the General Assembly is necessary, manifested in large part by support for these two draft resolutions. It depends also on Israel showing a commitment to reach a solution, principally through undertaking confidence-building measures. Other such measures include ending all illegal actions that hinder the peace process, showing political will to make progress on all tracks, improving the living conditions of Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza and ending all forms of collective punishment.

There is also a need to agree on fair negotiations on the problem of refugees on the basis of General Assembly resolution 194 (III), adopted in 1948. We also look forward to the United States continuing to play a leading role in the process, as well as to a more effective role for the Quartet, which will have the responsibility to follow up the implementation of what is agreed by the Palestinian and Israeli parties in reaching a two-State solution, by establishing an independent Palestinian state before the end of 2008 and achieving full withdrawal from all occupied Arab territories in the West Bank, the Golan Heights and the Shab'a farms. The end of occupation must be full and comprehensive, based on direct negotiations on all tracks and free of delays and prevarications aimed at imposing an illegal situation on the ground.

I have the pleasure today to introduce to the General Assembly two draft resolutions under agenda item 17, entitled "The situation in the Middle East", namely, draft resolution A/62/L.22, entitled "Jerusalem", and draft resolution A/62/L.23, entitled "The Syrian Golan".

The first draft resolution reaffirms that the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions dealing with the special status of East Jerusalem remain the main terms of reference. It also reaffirms the renunciation and repudiation of all legislative and administrative measures and actions undertaken by Israel — the occupying Power — aimed at altering the legal status and character of Jerusalem. Moreover, the draft resolution confirms that any just and comprehensive solution to the question of Jerusalem must take into consideration the legitimate concerns of both the Palestinian and Israeli sides and include provisions on international guarantees to assure its inhabitants' freedom of belief and religion, free from any illegal attempts by Israel to impose a Jewish character on the city.

The second draft resolution, on the occupied Syrian Golan (A/62/L.23), recalls Security Council resolution 497 (1981) and expresses deep concern over Israel's continued non-compliance with it. It also reaffirms the applicability of The Hague Convention of 1907 and the Fourth Geneva Convention, of 1949, to the Syrian territory occupied since 1967 and declares the illegitimacy of both the decision to apply Israeli law on this territory and the settlement activities there. The draft resolution demands once again that Israel withdraw from the Golan Heights to the line of 4 June 1967 and calls for the resumption of peace talks on the Syrian track and respect for commitments reached during the previous talks.

The sponsors of these two draft resolutions believe that the time has come for the international community to look at the Middle East from a comprehensive perspective, particularly in the light of ongoing efforts to move the peace process forward. The peoples of the region have suffered from the scourge of war and aggression, and aspire to achieve peace, stability and development. This cannot be without the international will to provide the political support necessary to achieve a breakthrough that can lead to full Israeli withdrawal from all Palestinian and Arab territories occupied since 1967, on the basis of international law, the principle of land for peace, the

Arab Peace Initiative, the Road Map, the Madrid terms of reference and the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions.

In order to attain this goal with the support of the international community, the sponsors look forward to the support of all Member States and their votes in favour of these two draft resolutions and in favour of achieving peace and stability in the Middle East.

Mr. Carmon (Israel): The situation in the Middle East is rapidly changing. Although some previously embraced the misleading narrative that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is the cause of instability in our region, the facts on the ground show precisely the opposite: that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is the consequence of instability caused by the rising extremism which is sweeping through our region.

The recent meeting in Annapolis highlighted the growing recognition and agreement that the real dangers to the region come directly from Islamic extremism and its champion, Iran, which sponsors terrorism around the globe, tries to attain nuclear weapons and relentlessly defies the will of the international community.

Indeed, the real situation in the Middle East was best articulated late last week by a Syrian member of parliament, who said there is an "alliance stretching from Tehran to Gaza". Syria today continues to be the home of forces of extremism and instability, hosting the headquarters of Hamas, Islamic Jihad and others and facilitating Hizbullah's rearming in southern Lebanon.

Behind almost every conflict in the Middle East we see the long arm and shadow of Iran. In Lebanon, Hizbullah — Iran's terrorist organization proxy — foments domestic instability and political deadlock. In the Palestinian areas, Hamas fires rockets and carries out suicide bombings with money and support from Iran. In Iraq, the insurgents and terrorists are financed and trained by Iran.

Iran's destabilizing activities are not restricted to our region. As we saw in the recent warrants issued by INTERPOL in the bombing of the AMIA Jewish Community Centre in Buenos Aires in 1994 and in the bombing of the Israeli Embassy in Buenos Aires two years earlier, in 1992, Iran has long funded and supported global terrorism. All the while, Iran's campaign of Holocaust denial and calls for Israel's destruction add rhetorical flair to its already murderous and bloody operations around the globe.

The recognized urgency of the Iranian threat has enabled the assembling of a like-minded group of moderate Muslim and Arab States of the region. The gathering in Annapolis reflects the hope for peace and security in the region and the Arab world's fear of the ominous threat from Iran.

In order to secure the situation in our region, the international community must stand up and confront the enemies of peace. Otherwise, progress will never be made — no matter how much we yearn for peace, no matter what we are willing to sacrifice for it.

We have the tools to deal with the extremist threat. For Lebanon, Security Council resolution 1701 (2006) must be fully implemented to ensure the security and stability of the region. Hizbullah continues redeploying in south Lebanon, and its arsenal continues to grow as weapons are transferred across the Lebanese-Syrian border in violation of the arms embargo. For the Palestinian areas, the Road Map clearly states the obligations and responsibilities of each side, in particular with regard to dismantling the terrorist infrastructure and an end to incitement and violence.

The terrorists and extremists have shown their cards. They will not back down. But the international community cannot surrender. The extremists seek to strip us of our most valuable possessions: the freedoms we enjoy and the tolerance and mutual understanding we promote.

The enemies of peace continue to hold in their perilous grasp our missing and captive sons, Gilad Shalit, Udi Goldwasser and Eldad Regev. Israel, and all those committed to peace and freedom, long for the day when our boys, Gilad, Eldad and Udi, will be brought back to their families and to their home.

The situation in our region leads us to two wholly contradictory conclusions. On the one hand, never before in the history of our region has there been such potential for peace and harmony. And on the other hand, never before in the history of our region has there been such potential for instability and tragedy. The choice between these two very different fates can only be made by the people of our region and their leaders.

In Israel, last week, we celebrated the thirtieth anniversary of the historic arrival of former Egyptian President Anwar Sadat in Jerusalem. This courageous, historic first visit by an Arab leader to Israel, and the speech he gave at the Israeli parliament, is to this day credited with changing the geopolitics of the entire Middle East, opening the path for peace between Israel and the Arab world and shaping a new agenda of political relations in the region.

President Sadat's courageous push for dialogue and common understanding was followed years later when King Hussein of Jordan travelled that same road to peace. Today, Israel, Egypt and Jordan have collectively known more years of peace than of confrontation and conflict, years in which open dialogue and cooperative ventures have been possible.

Yesterday, my delegation addressed the Israeli-Palestinian conflict (see A/62/PV.58), showing that, while the tragic choices made by the Arab States could have been averted 60 years ago, the realities of today that were seen in Annapolis suggest that the time is ripe for an agreement to be reached between the parties. There is a commitment by our respective leaders, Prime Minister Olmert and President Abbas, to the bilateral Israeli-Palestinian process, supported by the coalition of peace, the moderate Arab and Muslim States and the international community, who will do all that they can to bolster both of us.

History has shown the power and profound implications of the choices made by the leaders in our region. Let us hope that for us, in our time too, the right choices are made for the betterment of our region and for the betterment of our shared future.

Mr. Malmierca Díaz (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): I have the honour to address the General Assembly on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

The situation of instability in the Middle East, characterized by the expansion of Israeli settlements in the Gaza Strip, the continuation of the construction of the separation wall in the occupied Palestinian territory, the complex situation in Lebanon and the occupation of the Syrian Golan, is a reality affecting not only the region, but also the entire international community.

The Movement reiterates its deep regret that for 40 years, since 1967, the Palestinian people have suffered continuously under the brutal Israeli military occupation of their land, and that they continue to be denied their fundamental human rights, including the right to self-determination and the right of Palestine refugees to return to their land. The toll in human lives and the number of persons injured, displaced, homeless and without access to basic needs in the occupied Palestinian territory are increasing at an alarming rate. The poverty rate is currently 65.8 per cent in the occupied Palestinian territory, reaching more than 79 per cent in the Gaza Strip.

In flagrant defiance and disrespect of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice and in violation of General Assembly resolution ES-10/15 of 20 July 2004, which reaffirms the illegality of the construction of the separation wall on the West Bank and in East Jerusalem, Israel continues to build the wall. The Non-Aligned Movement remains concerned about the huge physical, economic and social devastation brought about by the wall, which divides the occupied Palestinian territory into isolated and fenced cantons, destroying entire communities and splitting East Jerusalem from the rest of the territory.

The Government of Lebanon has continuously endeavoured to stabilize the situation in its territory following Israel's relentless aggression and serious violations against the territorial integrity and sovereignty of that country. The Non-Aligned Movement reiterates its satisfaction with the steps undertaken by the Lebanese Government to implement Security Council resolution 1701 (2006), particularly through the deployment of the Lebanese Armed Forces in the areas south of the Litani River and along the Blue Line. The Movement also welcomes the deployment of the Lebanese Armed Forces along the northern and eastern borders of Lebanon in order to ensure security and stability on the borders.

The Movement remains deeply concerned about ongoing Israeli air and land violations of the Blue Line in breach of Security Council resolution 1701 (2006). We strongly call on Israel to end the occupation of the northern part of al-Ghajar, on the northern side of the Blue Line, to immediately refrain from any violation of Lebanese sovereignty and of Council resolution 1701 (2006) and to refrain from any provocation to the Lebanese Armed Forces or the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon.

The Movement calls for the prompt settlement of the question of the Sheba'a farms, in full respect for

Lebanese territorial integrity, as stipulated in resolution 1701 (2006). We call upon all parties to cooperate in protecting Lebanon's sovereign rights in that area, and we note the important endeavours of the Secretary-General in this regard.

The Movement is acutely aware of the enormous challenge facing Lebanon resulting from the 1.2 million cluster bomblets launched by Israel against Lebanon last summer. The Movement condemns once again the use of such weaponry by Israel and deplores the death toll resulting from them. The Non-Aligned Movement strongly calls upon Israel to provide the exact location of those deadly weapons and the maps of mines planted during its occupation of southern Lebanon.

The Non-Aligned Movement reaffirms once again that all measures and actions taken, or to be taken by Israel, the occupying Power, which purport to modify the legal, physical and demographic conditions and institutional structure of the occupied Syrian Golan, as well as Israeli measures to implement its jurisdiction and administration there, are null and void and have no legal effect.

We also reaffirm that all these measures and actions, including the illegal construction and expansion of the Israeli settlements in the Syrian Golan since 1967, are a clear violation of international law, international agreements, of the United Nations Charter and United Nations decisions including Security Council resolution 497 (1981) and of the Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, and that they are a challenge to the international community.

The Movement demands that Israel abide by Security Council resolution 497 (1981) and withdraw completely from the occupied Syrian Golan to the borders of 4 June 1967.

The Non-Aligned Movement sincerely hopes that the international meeting held in Annapolis will contribute effectively to the efforts towards a resumption of direct and substantive negotiations between the parties for the achievement of a comprehensive, just lasting and peaceful settlement, based on the relevant United Nations resolutions and in accordance with the rules and principles of international law.

The Non-Aligned Movement also expresses its hope that the Annapolis process will address all final status issues and will ultimately bring an end to the occupation of all of the Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967 and that remain under occupation, including the Palestinian territory, including East Jerusalem, and the occupied Syrian Golan, and will lead to the establishment of the independent State of Palestine, with East Jerusalem as its capital.

Mr. Ileka (Democratic Republic of the Congo), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The Non-Aligned Movement reaffirms once again its support for the Middle East peace process, on the basis of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967), 338 (1973), 425 (1978), 1397 (2002) and 1515 (2003) and the principle of land for peace. Likewise, we reject the attempts to modify the mandate of the peace process and the imposition of unilateral measures and strategies aimed at the imposition by Israel, the occupying Power, of an illegal unilateral solution.

The Non-Aligned Movement will continue to support and contribute in every possible way to the achievement of a just, complete and lasting peace in the Middle East, based on all relevant United Nations resolutions, the Madrid Conference terms of reference, the principle of land for peace, the Arab Peace Initiative and the Road Map.

Mr. Almansoor (Bahrain) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation aligns itself with the statement just made by the Permanent Representative of Cuba on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

This Assembly is meeting again, as we have been doing at this time each year, to discuss the agenda item entitled "The situation in the Middle East", where a state of conflict and tension has prevailed unprecedented in terms of duration and the grave effects that it has left. The situation will be more difficult to rectify as long as the occupation continues.

Those who follow reports on the situation in the Middle East are very worried about the continued deterioration of the situation in the region and the escalating tension caused by negative developments that arise from Israel's continued occupation of Arab land. This occupation has now lasted 40 years, and it continues in the occupied territories, forcing the people of the area to feel bitter, oppressed and threatened. It also creates serious disasters, even though we are in a new millennium, where most countries have been freed from the foreign occupation and hegemony they suffered for a long time. Other countries have now turned a new page in their histories, have attained national independence and occupy their proper place among all the States of the world.

It seems that the Israeli occupation, which has continued for so long, seeks to consolidate a fait accompli by constructing more settlements in the West Bank and the occupied Syrian Golan, by continuing the construction of the separation wall in the occupied Palestinian territories and by continuing the occupation of some Lebanese land. This creates facts that threaten not only the stability of the region, but the stability of the international community as a whole.

The Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian occupied territories reports in document A/62/275 that Israel's duties as an occupying Power do not decrease because of the long occupation. On the contrary, they become greater, because of the illegitimate acts carried out by this Power in the occupied territories.

The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People reported in paragraph 7 of its report (A/62/35) that these continuing Israeli policies posed a grave threat to the prospects of a negotiated, peaceful settlement because of continued illegal settlement activities in the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, and the illegal construction of the wall. That construction is contrary to the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice, which stated that the construction of the wall was contrary to international law, which prohibits the forceful annexation of territories or the carrying out of sovereign activities on the part of the occupying State for the purpose of changing the status of occupied territories.

Israel's decision to enforce its laws, its administration and its jurisdiction in the occupied Syrian Golan is contrary to international instruments and Security Council resolution 497 (1981), adopted on 17 December 1981, which invalidated the decision. That decision was judged to be null and void and without any legal or international merit. Despite that, Israel has started construction on three new tourist settlements on Lake Tiberias, according to information reported by the Economic and Social Council in document A/62/75 and as reported by the State Planning Commission at the Prime Minister's office of the Syrian Arab Republic. The number of settlements that have been actually constructed has reached 45 according to the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories (A/62/360). That information came from the report submitted by the Syrian Arab Republic, which also mentions that 22 settlements in the area from Mount Hermon in the north to Lake Tiberias in the south are now open to receiving new settlers.

The Washington Post reported on 30 October 2006 that Israel is officially seeking to double the number of settlers in the Golan over the next 10 years. The Secretary-General of the United Nations in his report (A/61/355, para. 14) reports that the Government of Israel has failed to implement its obligations under the Road Map to freeze its settlement activities and dismantle outposts constructed in the West Bank since March 2001. The report also mentioned that the Road Map had cited the end of 2005 as the target date for the settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Even though that deadline has passed, the Road Map remains the main reference and agreed framework for the achievement of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

The time has come to deal with this conflict seriously in order to reach a peaceful settlement, especially since the international peace conference, sponsored by President George W. Bush, which concluded its activities two days ago in Annapolis, focused on the core of the problem of the Middle East. That problem is different from any other struggle or conflict in the world because of the injustice and wrongs suffered by one people for over 40 years. Facts throughout the years of Israeli occupation of Arab territories have proven the failure of military and unilateral solutions, which have only led to more destruction and more violence. This should lead the international community as a whole to move towards supporting efforts to resume negotiations between all parties related to this conflict, encouraging them to achieve a just and comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict and supporting the continued emphasis by Arab States of their commitment to the choice of a just and comprehensive peace, as expressed in the various summit and ministerial meetings and in the Arab Peace Initiative of 2002.

Undoubtedly, the Annapolis conference aimed to push the negotiations forward and to achieve a two-State solution on the basis of a firm and defined time frame according to the terms of reference mentioned in the Arab Peace Initiative and other relevant references. They provide a firm foundation for achieving the desired settlement, since Israel's withdrawal from Palestinian territories will achieve the just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East and the establishment of a viable Palestinian state able to grow and develop.

It is not impossible to achieve all of this. Needless to say, the political framework for a settlement is found in all the relevant resolutions adopted by the United Nations, including the Security Council. That framework constitutes the legal foundation for a political solution.

However, our success will depend fundamentally on whether Israel has the political will to reach a peaceful settlement of the conflict. Israel must cease all practices and military activities that undermine the peace process, including its policies of deliberate murder, starvation, siege and punishment of innocent civilians. Moreover, it must release detainees and prisoners, halt all settlement activity and improve the difficult living conditions of the Palestinian people in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.

All of us hope that the international peace Conference held at Annapolis will serve as a new beginning, propelling forward the faltering peace process with a view to the establishment of a comprehensive framework for a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. We look forward to support from the entire international community, particularly the Quartet, for any peace effort aimed at achieving a just and comprehensive peace for all parties and a complete Israeli withdrawal from all occupied Arab territories, including the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, the occupied Syrian Golan and Lebanese territories.

Ultimately, these negotiations must achieve a settlement on all tracks — a settlement free from the tactics of intimidation, threats, the use of force and the imposition of faits accomplis. Such a solution will depend on political will and good faith, which alone will lead to a just and comprehensive peace in the region.

Mr. Ja'afari (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): More than 40 years have passed since the Israeli occupation of Arab territories, and more than 60 years have passed since the Palestinian tragedy. Those long years have witnessed tragedy and the denial of the rights of millions of Palestinians and more than half a million Syrians, whom Israel forced to leave their villages and towns. During the same period, the Arab side has done its utmost to arrive at a comprehensive and just solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict and has accepted the provisions and resolutions of international legality in order to put an end to this explosive situation, which has had a negative impact on peace and security throughout the region and beyond. Years have also passed since the Arab Peace Initiative was adopted by Arab leaders at the 2002 Beirut Summit. The General Assembly and the Security Council have adopted hundreds of resolutions requesting Israel to put an end to its occupation of Arab territories, Palestinian territories and the Syrian Golan.

Unfortunately, it is abundantly clear from all of this that Israel rejects peace, in which it does not believe. Israel is obstinately escalating its aggression in order to carry out its policies of terrorism, murder, destruction, siege and colonization.

Israel's position is designed to undermine the comprehensive peace process and to weaken its terms of reference so that the issue of the Arab-Israeli conflict will be addressed within frameworks unrelated to the Middle East peace process. Successive Israeli Governments would not have been successful in their delaying tactics and their defiance of the will of the international community were it not for the negativism of certain parties, which refuse to impose deterring sanctions against Israel, and the complicity of others in encouraging Israel not to abide by its obligations under the Charter and the relevant Security Council resolutions.

Israel, which carries out daily massacres of Palestinians and which waged a destructive war against Lebanon last year, is constantly creating tensions in an already tense region and continues to defy international legality, despite the rejection by the international community, including the Security Council, of the Israeli Knesset's decision to impose Israeli laws on the occupied Syrian Golan. In particular, Security Council resolution 497 (1981) affirmed that the Israeli decision was null and void and without international legal effect. Despite that, Israel continues to build and expand settlements, which number 45 to date.

Israel continues to arrest large numbers of Syrian citizens in the occupied Syrian Golan and condemns them to unjust decades-long sentences, in addition to replacing Syrian educational curricula with Israeli ones, stealing the water of the Golan, imposing prohibitive taxes on the agricultural products of Syrian farmers, uprooting trees, confiscating lands and planting mines, which have wounded 598 Syrian citizens, including 17 children. Israel also buries nuclear waste in Golan lands, which is contrary to international law and the provisions of international legality. We have raised these serious issues in the United Nations and its specialized agencies, including the World Health Organization, the International Labour Organization and the Human Rights Council, and we are waiting for those organizations to submit their reports on this matter to the United Nations.

In a new attempt to scatter the population of the occupied Golan, Israeli occupation authorities have warned the inhabitants of the Syrian village Al-Ghajar that those who live in the northern part of the village — who constitute 90 per cent of its population — will have to relocate to the southern part. That means that the Israeli authorities are confiscating 900 dunams of the village's territory.

Israel's political arrogance and its refusal to respect international legality is perhaps reflected most clearly in the statements made by Israeli leaders, who have confirmed their intention to continue their occupation of the Golan. In the middle of May of this year, a new settlement in Allone HaBashan was announced. Israel began selling housing units at one quarter of the initial value in order to encourage settlers to establish themselves in the Golan. This settlement was built on the ruins of the Arab Syrian village of Al-Juezah. That initiative was set up by the regional Council of Golan, with the intention increasing the number of settlers in the Golan and of changing the demographic status.

The occupying authorities have continued to steal the wealth and natural resources of the Golan, starting with water. Israel continues its excavation with the aim of building a reservoir of 2 million cubic metres of water in the occupied area, which lies near Quneitra and is only 10 metres away from the ceasefire line, opposite the part occupied by Israel and parallel to the Mansoura dam. Those Israeli actions are a violation of international law and Security Council resolutions 242 (1967), 338 (1973) and 497 (1981).

I take this opportunity to call on all Member States to vote in favour of the draft resolution relating to the Syrian Golan as an expression of the international community's rejection of the occupation and as a clear message to Israel that Member States do uphold the rule of law in international relations.

The occupation authorities have dozens of Syrian citizens from the Golan in their incarceration centres and prisons simply because they have refused to accept the occupation and to be identified as Israelis. Some of those Syrian detainees are very seriously threatened by the conditions of their detentions. We have submitted this information to the United Nations Secretariat and to the Security Council, as well as to the High Commissioner for Human Rights, the International Committee of the Red Cross and the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices, so that Israel can be made accountable for its misconduct and so that pressure can be exerted on it to release the Syrian detainees and prisoners whose human rights are being violated.

Because of Israel's violations of political and humanitarian rights, the Human Rights Council adopted resolution 2/3, entitled "Human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan", on 27 November 2006. Since the occupation began, our citizens in the occupied Golan have led an ongoing resistance to the occupation and have refused any attempts at being "judaized" by refusing to accept an Israeli identity. Instead, they hold fast to their Syrian identity. On all possible occasions our citizens in the Golan emphasize that no matter how long the occupation lasts and how hard Israel tries to impose a fait accompli, the occupied lands will be returned to the Syrian motherland. That was reaffirmed by the President of the Syrian Arab Republic, Mr. Bashar Al-Assad, when he said that we are more than prepared to achieve peace but that we are not prepared to give up our lands; we do not allow our sovereignty to be infringed upon; our citizens in the occupied Golan will not be, now or ever, anything other than Syrian Arabs; and no matter the length of the occupation, the land will be ours sooner or later.

The suspicious movements and recent military movements in the occupied Syrian Golan are particularly distressing and in flagrant violation of international law, the United Nations Charter and Security Council resolutions. At midnight on 6 September 2007, the Israeli Air force violated Syrian airspace. That was not Israel's first violation of Syrian airspace. Israel did not hesitate to commit similar crimes, like bombing Syrian civilian installations in 2003, in flagrant defiance of its obligations under the Israel-Syria Disengagement Agreement of 1974. That is solid proof of Israel's obstinate intent to choose the path of aggression and escalation instead of choosing peace as a future path for good relations with the peoples and countries of the region.

We here reaffirm that the failure of the Security Council on a number of occasions to condemn that aggression has encouraged Israel to step up its aggressive stunts, which have increased tensions in the area and have threatened international peace and security, all which will have serious and uncontrollable consequences.

The use of veto power by a superpower dozens of times has now become a monopoly used to protect Israel. There are also certain sources in this country that have spread rumours and erroneous news to justify the latest Israeli occupation. This is a falsification of facts and is quite irresponsible, protecting the occupation rather than condemning it and punishing the occupiers. It must be recalled that certain countries had to wage war, without the agreement of the United Nations, under similar pretexts.

On 27 November 2007, a conference was held in Annapolis for the purpose of relaunching the peace process between the Arabs and Israel. We took part in that meeting, and we are committed to participating in all international efforts to achieve a just and lasting peace in the region through negotiations on all tracks of the peace process. Most of the parties at the conference insisted on the importance of a just and comprehensive peace in the region and the need to launch peace negotiations on all tracks, especially the pivotal issue of the occupied Syrian Golan. That means that Israel would have to give up its occupation of Arab territories in Palestine, including East Jerusalem, the Syrian Golan Heights and the Lebanese Shaba'a farms.

The General Assembly has been considering the situation in the Middle East for several decades with the understanding that this item deals with the Arab-Israeli conflict and with the need to end Israel's occupation of Arab lands. Throughout the years Israel has constantly justified its continuing persecution of the Palestinian people and has continued to justify its defiance of the resolutions of international legality on weak and changing pretexts. This is designed to shift the blame to certain countries in or outside the region in order to expand the conflict and to stand in the way of any possible solution to the conflict.

The sole reality in the situation in the Middle East is that since 5 June 1967 Israel has been occupying the territory of others by force. It continues to build settlements in the Palestinian territories and in the Syrian Golan. It continues to carry out policies of assassination and premeditated murder and to violate the Geneva Conventions. The sole reality in the situation in the Middle East is that Israel does not wish to live in peace in the region.

In Israel's eyes, just and comprehensive peace does not constitute a definitive solution. That is why it introduced nuclear weapons into the Middle East in the 1950s, at a time when China, India and Pakistan did not yet possess such weapons. Israel refused to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons or to submit its nuclear installations to International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards. Those are the realities.

Finally, the Syrian Arab Republic has repeatedly affirmed that peace is our strategic choice, that we seek genuine peace and that we are not the party that is standing in the way of such peace. We are among the founding Members of the United Nations, and we bear the responsibility to respect the principles and purposes of the Charter and to combat injustice and aggression. It is the international community's duty to promote justice and the rule of law and to put an end to Israeli occupation and aggression, which are the sole reason for the ongoing violence and tension in the Middle East.

President Bashar Al-Assad recently said that the Israelis must understand that genuine, lasting peace is more beneficial than any transitory situation, and that the price of such peace will be far lower than the cost of occupation and aggression, which cannot continue.

Mr. Lasloom (Saudi Arabia) (*spoke in Arabic*): The General Assembly met yesterday and is meeting again today to consider the situation in the Middle East and the question of Palestine, to reaffirm its support for and solidarity with the Palestinian people and to repeat, as we do year after year, that it is high time for the Palestinian people, which has long suffered under the yoke of an odious and harsh occupation, to regain its rights and freedom, to determine its own future and to establish an independent State on its own territory, with Al-Quds Al-Sharif as its capital.

Today, we note that the Annapolis Conference is generating a new atmosphere of hope and optimism that could put an end to the suffering that has lasted too long and which has been a weight on the world's conscience. The Palestinian people have the same right as any other to aspire to peace, security and freedom. They may yet enjoy their rights after so many years of absurd delays, postponements, procrastination and excuses; we may yet see the end of an occupation that has caused so much tragedy and so much pain. There is no doubt that all of this depends on the good faith and sincere determination of the parties, failing which this ray of hope could fade away once again and become yet another link in the long chain of disappointment, affliction, war and suffering that has bound the peoples of the region.

Two days ago, along with other Arab countries, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia accepted the generous invitation of President George W. Bush of the United States of America to attend the international Annapolis Conference on peace. We did so in order to reaffirm, side by side with other Arab and Muslim States, our total commitment to a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East. Today, everything hinges on the success or failure of this effort, at a time when the peace process has been frozen for so many years, a situation which gave free rein to extremism, frustration and despair — which have reached such proportions that it is hard to calculate their dire consequences.

The time has come for an end to this conflict and for the capacities and the endeavours of the peoples of the region to be focused on peace and development rather than on stoking the fires of war, whose flames will spare no one.

In Annapolis, my country, side by side with other Arab and Muslim countries, reiterated its willingness to relaunch serious and continuous negotiations between the Israelis and the Palestinians, encompassing all final-status issues and soon to be followed by negotiations on the Syrian and Lebanese tracks, with a view to putting an end to the occupation of the Syrian Golan and the Lebanese Sheba'a farmlands. Everyone will have taken careful note of the fact that the United States and the Quartet have voiced their full commitment to a final settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict within a defined time frame; this will depend on the goodwill of all.

The terms of reference of the negotiations on all tracks must be consistent with the relevant United Nations resolutions, the Road Map, the Arab Peace Initiative, international legitimacy, the Madrid Peace Conference terms of reference and the principle of land for peace. It is also absolutely necessary that an international mechanism be established to closely follow progress in the negotiations among the parties and to monitor the implementation of the outcome of the negotiations.

From paragraph 14 of the report of the Secretary-General (A/62/344), we can see that Israeli excavations in the area of the Al-Aqsa mosque and Al-Haram Al-Sharif and its Mughrabi Gate have led to "civil disorder and tension". The fact that Israel continues to impose faits accomplis has been a continuous obstacle to finding a peaceful solution. Israel has not met its commitments under the Road Map, which calls for a total freeze on the construction of settlements and the dismantling of existing outposts as described in paragraph 15 of the Secretary-General's report (A/62/344). The continuing construction of the separation wall has let to confiscation of more land and has further prevented the free movement of people and goods in violation of the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice issued in July 2004. That, in addition to Israel's refusal to implement the Agreement on Movement and Access of November 2005, which raised the number of closures to 532, in August 2007 alone, which created further obstacles to economic activity (A/62/344, para. 17).

If that is how Israeli practices are described in the report of the Secretary-General and if we compare the picture in the report with the climate of optimism in Annapolis, then it is our duty to warn all of the parties concerned — and Israel, in particular — of the need to adopt proper and essential measures without further delay if final status negotiations are to be taken seriously. As a starting point, we would suggest an end to all settlement activities, the removal of all outposts, release of Palestinian prisoners, and a complete halt to the construction of the separation wall, the embargo, the blockades and the checkpoints that are affecting the Palestinian people.

Israel claims that the Israeli-Arab conflict is not a threat to stability in the region. This is totally misleading and unhelpful, since the reality on the ground is exactly the opposite, which the entire world can see.

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has never idly stood by watching developments in the Middle East, but has instead launched several serious initiatives to put an end to the conflict. Saudi Arabia remains committed to the peace process and to the vision of a two-State solution. I wish to quote His Majesty, the Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques: Peace springs from the hearts and minds, not from the barrel of a gun or the explosion of a missile. After having bet unsuccessfully on war for so long, it is time for Israel to opt for peace and to realize that peace cannot be established in the area while there is continued occupation of Arab land.

Since we are examining the situation in the Middle East today, we cannot gloss over the situations in Iraq and Lebanon. Both situations require that we mobilize our efforts, cooperate and coordinate to help these brotherly peoples put an end to their long suffering. Saudi Arabia has always emphasized the need to support the territorial integrity of Iraq, its independence and its sovereignty, as well as the need to refrain from any interference in its internal affairs.

We consider brotherly and neighbourly Iraq as an integral part of the Arab and Islamic nation and its people — in all their multiplicity and diversity of beliefs — as a brotherly people without discrimination against creed, ethnicity or religion. We stand equidistantly from all Iraq's components and political trends. Our deep feelings for the suffering of the brotherly Iraqi people is comparable only to our continuous commitment to help Iraqis overcome their tragic situation.

We also renew our commitment to make every effort to help the brotherly people of Lebanon to overcome the tragic situation in their country. Saudi Arabia hopes that our Lebanese brothers and sisters will be able to agree on a consensus candidate as soon as possible to occupy the presidential post that has been vacant for some time. We urge all of the parties and factions in Lebanon to display wisdom and sagacity and to overcome those difficult circumstances.

Mr. Maurer (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): Switzerland welcomes the results of the Annapolis Conference, specifically the commitment of the parties to resume negotiations on a final settlement of the conflict by the end of 2008, as well as the reaffirmation of the obligations set out in the Road Map and the acceptance to create a monitoring mechanism under the aegis of the United States.

We hope that the process the parties have embarked upon will bring the expected results. It is crucial that the parties to the conflict fulfil the commitments they have entered into or which they have reaffirmed and that they keep the channel of dialogue and negotiation open in all circumstances. The aim is to turn into reality the right of Israel to live in peace within secure and internationally recognized borders and the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and to the establishment of a viable Palestinian state.

This having been said, the Annapolis process will only be able to win support on both sides and to succeed if it leads to a tangible improvement in the everyday lives of Palestinians and Israelis. In that context, we wish to mention that the political process will win credibility through a parallel process of economic recovery of a similar scope. We therefore welcome the plan of the Quartet's Special Envoy, Mr. Tony Blair, and the donors' conference that will take place in Paris on 17 December 2007.

All discussions must be inclusive. We therefore call for the resumption of the intra-Palestinian dialogue to allow a national consensus to emerge. The political parties must overcome their differences in order to address the hopes of their people for peace. It is only by following this path that the Palestinian Authority will be able to re-establish its authority over the entire occupied Palestinian territory and take the necessary measures to ensure security, good governance and respect for human rights, and establish itself as a reliable partner capable of implementing the commitments it enters in the context of the peace process.

In this context, we are concerned about the economic situation in Gaza. The economic and social situation must receive special attention. The consequences of the total and prolonged closure of the borders on the socio-economic fabric have been terrible. The announcement of a progressive reduction in the supply of energy augurs very badly. While we fully understand the security concerns expressed by Israel and by Egypt and comprehend that the Palestinian Authority cannot accept the faits accomplis presented by armed groups in Gaza, it is nonetheless our common duty to recall the importance of international law. The Palestinian population of Gaza has the right the right to as normal a life as possible in keeping with the Geneva Conventions and other international human rights instruments. It must not be punished or held hostage by the political situation. So-called security measures must be as contained as possible and must not be carried out for purely political ends. It is urgent to allow economic life to recover by reopening the border crossing points, in conformity with the Agreement on Movement and Access of 15 November 2005.

The territorial unity of the occupied Palestinian territory — Gaza, the West Bank and East Jerusalem — must be maintained and respected. While the situation in Gaza presents a particular challenge, the situation in the West Bank is also far from being satisfactory. Annapolis promises, through its references to the Quartet's Road Map, a number of measures that we hope will be implemented very soon. We would like to recall, in particular, the freeze on the expansion of settlements, the evacuation of the settler outposts and all measures aimed at relaxing restrictions placed on the movement of people and goods and at granting international and humanitarian personnel unrestricted freedom of access without risk to their safety and without hindrance. The Road Map obligations are also applicable in the Gaza Strip.

The security challenge presented by the regular firing of Qassam rockets at Sderot and other Israeli localities neighbouring Gaza must be acknowledged. These attacks against essentially civilian targets are completely unacceptable and represent violations of humanitarian law. They are a reminder of the importance of the fight against terrorism, which is also an integral part of the Road Map.

It is essential that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict be resolved. The conflict is at the centre of the Middle East issue, and its effects extend far beyond the region. At the same time, the other conflicts between Israel and its neighbours — whose origins are a consequence of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict — must not be forgotten. Until those conflicts are resolved, the region will never find the stability that it needs, not only in its own interest but in that of the whole world. We therefore hope that the efforts of the international community will soon also embrace the concerns of Syria and Lebanon.

I would like to conclude with some thoughts on Lebanon. A solution to the crisis seems to be emerging. We encourage the people of Lebanon to overcome their differences so that the election of a President and the restoration of functioning institutions can take place. Internal problems are certainly at the root of the tense and precarious situation in Lebanon, but the situation is also partly a reflection of unresolved conflicts throughout the region. We therefore urge all States that sincerely want to move Lebanon forward to exercise their influence, with the aim of strengthening the unity and stability of the country. This stability will also mean stability for the entire region. The involvement of many States, including Switzerland, in helping the Lebanese people emerge from this deadlock demonstrates the importance of this country and their respect for its integrity.

Mr. İlkin (Turkey): Turkey has aligned itself with the statement delivered by the representative of Portugal on behalf of the European Union. Therefore, my remarks will be brief.

After a long period of recriminations, tension and violence in the Middle East, today we have an opportunity to reverse this adverse cycle. A ray of hope has emerged regarding the question of Palestine, which lies at the very heart of all ills in the Middle East, with wide repercussions both in and beyond the region.

We therefore welcome the Joint Declaration of the Annapolis Conference. We applaud the commitment of both sides to conclude an agreement before the end of 2008 and to implement their respective obligations under the Road Map. It is highly encouraging to see the beginning of serious engagement between Israel and Palestine with a clear objective of a two-State solution, responding to the aspirations of the Palestinians for a homeland and those of Israel for security.

The period ahead will undoubtedly be of crucial importance. Both parties will inevitably encounter difficulties and will have to make difficult sacrifices and decisions. Indeed, a deal may be as hard as ever to reach. Yet there can be no substitute for peace, and the consequences of failure would be devastating for all. In order to achieve the ultimate goal, it is essential that both Israelis and Palestinians should, more than ever, act with utmost restraint and try to build on mutual confidence.

Thus, we call upon Israel to reconsider its policies, which have not delivered the sense of security it rightfully seeks and deserves. It is evident that ending the settlement activities and easing the pressure of the occupation could change a lot on the ground. We also remain concerned at the humanitarian issues affecting Palestinians, particularly in Gaza. The living conditions in the Gaza Strip have become intolerable and have even started to threaten future generations. We agree with the Secretary-General that punitive measures which harm the well-being of an entire population are unacceptable. Such steps serve only to build up further resentment.

On the other hand, we believe that Palestinians should be steadfast in stepping up their efforts to remove radical elements from the scene. We welcome the commitment displayed by President Abbas at the Annapolis Conference to combat chaos, violence and terrorism, and to ensure security, order and the rule of law.

After years of broken promises and bloodshed, it is crucial that Israelis and Palestinians agree this time on concrete steps that will show their people that life is changing for the better. These steps should, first and foremost, focus on economic and trade areas, where the merits of cooperation can be felt in tangible terms. In this vein, we welcome the efforts of Mr. Tony Blair, the Quartet Representative, and hope that the forthcoming donors' conference in Paris will be successful in gathering sufficient support for the empowerment of Palestinians. Such success is essential for the prospect of peace to be viable.

In the meantime, Turkey will continue to contribute to the process of undertaking confidence-building measures and increased interaction between Israelis and Palestinians. The recent joint declaration regarding the establishment of an industrial zone in the West Bank, which was issued in Ankara, is a very encouraging step. When completed, this enterprise will generate a great number of jobs for Palestinians and thus also constitute a security-provider for Israel. It also responds to the objectives of reinvigorating the local private sector and attracting the interest of sources of foreign capital. We sincerely hope that the spirit of cooperation and understanding displayed by the leaders of Israel and Palestine during their visit to Ankara will have a positive impact on future talks. Incidentally, the leaders were able to address the Turkish parliament on the same day, one after another.

We must all fully support the leaders of Israel and Palestine in their courageous endeavours to built a safe and better future for their peoples, thus consolidating peace, cooperation and harmony in the region.

The interwoven nature of the problems in the Middle East necessitates a holistic and comprehensive perspective and approach. Needless to say, without addressing the Syrian and Lebanese tracks, the picture remains incomplete. We are heartened by the Syrian participation in the Annapolis Conference, and we hope to see some progress on this track, too, in the period ahead.

We have been following the developments in Lebanon with deep concern and we would like to see a sense of national unity prevail over factional, religious and ethnical considerations in that country. We will continue our efforts, including our contributions to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, to assist in restoring stability in Lebanon. We hope and expect that the courage, determination and resilience of the people of Lebanon will enable them to overcome all their difficulties.

As for Iraq, we wish to emphasize once again that the integrity and unity of that country hold the key not only to regional but also to global security and stability. Ensuring a dignified place within the international community for a territorially intact, nationally unified and democratic Iraq at peace with itself and its neighbours is always is in the forefront of our concerns.

Today we have an opportunity to show that the Middle East is not condemned to eternal strife. We have an opportunity to show that the region, once the cradle of civilizations and the economic heartland of the world, can indeed solve its problems and unleash a huge potential. That opportunity must be seized. We are duty-bound to future generations. Otherwise, another failed attempt would just sow more anger and despair in a region already drowning in both.

Mr. Ould Hadrami (Mauritania) (*spoke in Arabic*): The situation is very encouraging following the holding of the Annapolis Conference on 27 November. Nevertheless, the road to the culmination of the peace process is long and arduous, and it requires joint international efforts on the part of everyone to ensure peace in the Middle East region, which stands out as a region of international trade and a source of the world's energy. To work towards peace and security is one of the enduring values of the foreign policy of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania, which firmly believes that ensuring justice and respect for international law and the resolutions of the United Nations are the most effective way to reduce tensions and wars and reinvigorate peace and cooperation between peoples and civilizations.

The ongoing Arab-Israeli conflict continues to pose a serious challenge to aspirations to peace, constitutes a flagrant violation of United Nations resolutions and is the focal point for tensions that endanger international peace and security. The framework and general conditions for a just, lasting and comprehensive resolution of the conflict have been for years set out by the General Assembly and the Security Council. They are also stipulated in the Arab Peace Initiative, which guarantees peace and security and includes recognition of Israel by Arab countries in exchange for an end to the occupation of Arab territories and a mutually acceptable solution to all outstanding problems. Israel should seize this historic opportunity to align itself with international law, so that the peoples of the region can coexist peaceably and the Palestinian people can regain their usurped rights by establishing an independent state, with East Jerusalem as its capital.

The question of Palestine is obviously the core issue in the Arab-Israeli conflict. We must also consider the other tracks of the peace process, namely, Israel's withdrawal from the Syrian Golan and the occupied Lebanese territories. This is an interdependent peace process, which means that all those matters must be resolved simultaneously if peace is to prevail in the region. The holding of the Annapolis Conference provides a glimmer of hope that we will be able to achieve a just and lasting solution to this bitter and longstanding conflict. The Islamic Republic of Mauritania very much appreciates the strong will of all parties to resume serious negotiations in order to find a lasting solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict. Such a solution will come about only through the establishment of an independent, sovereign Palestinian State within the borders that existed before the 1967 war, existing side by side with Israel. Israel should take practical steps to encourage peace negotiations and give them a strong impetus, in particular, by releasing all Palestinian prisoners, halting the construction of its wall of separation, ending military sieges and incursions into Palestinian towns and entering immediately into peace negotiations on all tracks. We in Mauritania shall spare no effort to ensure the success of the peace process. We call on the international community to provide the requisite material and moral support in order to achieve success in the peace process, in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions, including those of the Security Council, the Arab Peace Initiative and the principle of land for peace, so as to preserve peace, justice and international security.

Mr. Al-Allaf (Jordan) (*spoke in Arabic*): Now that the Annapolis Conference has come to an end, the conflict in the Middle East is entering a new and decisive phase in which the international will is united behind the central theme of an independent, contiguous, and viable Palestinian state with East Jerusalem as its capital. The Annapolis Conference has contributed to broad international consensus and support, which the international community clearly witnessed earlier this week.

The proposed time frame for a comprehensive agreement by the end of 2008 places two challenges before the international community, the most important of which is that we must not waste time in achieving the desired result. Work must begin immediately. Failure to act will lead to grave consequences that will feed extremism, heighten conflict and instability in the region and pose a major threat to international peace and security.

The question of Palestine is the primary priority of His Majesty King Abdullah II, as made clear from his continuing contacts with all parties in an effort to establish an independent Palestinian state that can live in peace and security with its neighbours. That is important not only because it is the central issue and the primary prerequisite for a solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict, but also because it will have a direct impact on regional security and stability. Finding a solution to the conflict will enable the region to rearrange its priorities, properly utilize its resources and focus on the imperatives of social and economic development in a way that ensures prosperity and stability for the nations of the region.

The international Annapolis Conference was a very important and serious beginning towards establishing a Palestinian state within a specific time frame and towards ending many decades of occupation. We must use the momentum created by the Conference to achieve just and durable peace in the region on all tracks, based on resolutions of international legitimacy. Jordan will work with all the relevant actors to overcome obstacles hindering the achievement of a just solution to final status issues that leads to the establishment of a Palestinian state on Palestine's national soil.

At this stage, the international community must work with the Palestinian and Israeli sides to implement the requirements of this phase. An end to the violence and efforts to reach peace are not the sole responsibilities of one party alone. Israel must promote an atmosphere of confidence by stopping its expansion of settlements; facilitating the movement of Palestinians; removing obstacles, checkpoints and barricades; halting the construction of the separation wall that encroaches upon Palestinian cities, villages and lands; and helping Palestinians to meet their commitment to build their economy and to activate and consolidate their institutions.

It is also time for Israel to start sending positive signals in the context of confidence-building measures by withdrawing from the Palestinian territories that it reoccupied in the West Bank in September 2000. It must also cease all activities in East Jerusalem that jeopardize the peace negotiations and the possibility of reaching a final status settlement.

At the same time, the Palestinians must proceed with reforms and fulfil their commitments by ensuring the state of security and stability that Israel and the region seek. They must assume their own responsibility to organize their security services under the auspices of the Palestinian Authority. They must maintain the rule of law and order in the lands controlled by the Authority. In that respect, we emphasize Jordan's full support for Palestinian legitimacy, represented in the Palestinian National Authority and its President, Mr. Mahmoud Abbas. Jordan looks forward optimistically to the follow-up meeting in Paris to finance the creation of a Palestinian state in the form of system-wide budgets and the financing of concrete projects in the various economic and social sectors.

Political negotiations on final status must be serious and clearly defined, accompanied by immediate measures to mitigate the suffering of Palestinians and improve their living conditions. In that context, Jordan reaffirms its full commitment to support both parties in any way possible to achieve an agreement on all principal issues and to overcome all obstacles they might encounter. We are resolved to work for the establishment of a Palestinian state pursuant to the resolution of international legitimacy, the Arab Peace Initiative and the Road Map. The forthcoming negotiations must include the fulfilment and implementation of those requirements.

Given Jordan's geographic location, its integral connection to the history of the Arab-Israeli conflict, its moderate policies and its unlimited support for the Palestinian people, we believe that the 2008 negotiations will serve as a focus of our attention. That is true not only because Jordan is the host country for the largest number of Palestinian refugees, and the third party that bears the greatest burden of the consequences and effects of the conflict, but also because the final status issues — refugees, security, borders, water, Jerusalem and settlements — are directly linked to Jordan's concerns, national priorities, interests and overall national security.

We hope to find definitive solutions to those issues within the time frame approved at the Annapolis meetings. The Jordanian policy on that matter, which is led and directed by His Majesty King Abdallah II, is based on full coordination with all parties to facilitate the achievement of just and permanent solutions to all the principal issues in a fully cooperative manner that protects the rights of all affected parties.

If the region is to enjoy lasting security and stability, peace must be comprehensive. Peace negotiations must address the Syrian-Israeli track, including a just resolution to the question of the occupied Golan Heights. They must also encompass the Lebanese-Israeli track. We must therefore exploit every opportunity to achieve real progress on all these tracks and intensify international efforts in the coming stage in order to end the Israeli occupation of all Arab territories.

With respect to conditions in Iraq, Jordan is fully committed to supporting the unity of Iraqi territories and the achievement of peace, stability and security there, given the importance of security to all States of the region. There remains an urgent need for true national reconciliation in Iraq based on the principle of the unity of the State and its exclusive right to maintain security on its own territory. Jordan is confident that the Iraqis are the most capable party to shape their own future, and Jordan supports all efforts to enable the

Iraqi Government exclusively to extend its sovereignty and authority throughout the country.

As to Lebanon, the international community must not hesitate to provide all forms of support to that country and its Government. The solidarity and unity of Lebanon are the only option to ensure its stability and to impel its march towards democracy. In that respect, we emphasize Jordan's firm commitment to supporting the stability of Lebanon and all those who want to keep it secure and stable.

Mr. Al-Murad (Kuwait) (*spoke in Arabic*): The General Assembly is discussing today one of the most important items on its agenda, the significance of which is due to its close link to international peace and security. For many decades, the Middle East did not enjoy stability, despite its vitality and importance, as a result of the wars that bedevilled it and drained its energies and resources.

Perhaps the most significant issue besetting the region — one that threatens to further worsen its security and stability — is the persistence and continuation of the Israeli Government's policies and aggressive and illegal practices. The Israeli Government has followed a policy based on the use of force to impose its so-called security, while it continues its occupation of territories. Events have proven the futility of that formula, and Israel's persistence in following it will only lead to a further deterioration of security conditions, fuel the sentiments of hatred and perpetuate the cycle of violence and instability in the region.

Israel pursues aggressive practices characterized by assassinations, extrajudicial executions, excessive and random use of military force, the demolition of homes, the destruction of Palestinian institutions, the closure of crossing points, ongoing blockades, collective punishment, collective arrests, arbitrary detentions, and the demeaning treatment of detainees in Israeli prisons. It persists in its construction of the separation wall, despite the fact that the International Court of Justice, in its advisory opinion on 9 July 2004, confirmed the wall's illegality, based on its contravention of decisions of international legitimacy, and demanded its removal and the compensation of Palestinians harmed by its construction.

All those practices represent a clear and flagrant violation of the 1949 Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Times of War. States parties to the Convention must take tangible measures to activate its provisions as part of their commitment to enforcing Israel's respect for the Convention.

Despite the passage of 40 years since Israel occupied Palestinian and Arab land, the situation in the occupied Palestinian territories, including East Jerusalem, remains very grave. The humanitarian, economic, social and security situation continues to deteriorate. The Palestinian people are still without a State and continue to be persecuted and robbed of their property. They suffer from the mounting hardships they face in the course of their continued struggle to activate their inalienable rights, including the right to self-determination. Every year that passes brings more oppression for the Palestinian people and more refugees.

In that context, Kuwait reiterates its support for the struggle of the Palestinian people to obtain all their legitimate political rights and to establish their own State on their own land, with East Jerusalem as its capital. We emphasize that as long as the Palestinian people do not obtain their legitimate rights in accordance with the relevant Security Council resolutions — in particular resolutions 242 (1967), 338 (1973), 1397 (2002) and 1515 (2003) — and on the basis of the principle of land for peace and the Arab Peace Initiative, there will be no lasting, comprehensive and just solution to the Palestinian question, which is at the heart of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Kuwait also reiterates its demand for Israel's withdrawal from the occupied Syrian Golan to the lines of 4 June 1967, in implementation of the relevant Security Council resolutions. We also emphasize the illegitimacy of Israeli activities in the occupied Golan and stress that the continued occupation and annexation of the Golan pose a real impediment to the achievement of just and comprehensive peace in the region.

With regard to the Lebanese question, we reiterate Kuwait's commitment to stand by Lebanon and to support it in preserving its security, unity, territorial integrity and political independence. We call on Israel to cease its ongoing violations of Lebanese airspace and territory and to withdraw from the Shab'a farms and the village of Al-Ghajar.

We commend regional and international efforts made to achieve national reconciliation between the various Lebanese parties, their return to the negotiating table and a national dialogue to address all issues of contention. We call upon the international community to help and support the Lebanese Government in extending its authority over all its territories.

The Annapolis conference for peace in the Middle East, which concluded its work two days ago with large-scale Arab and international participation, is an important and serious renewed effort to put an end to the occupation and to establish a Palestinian State within a specific timeframe. The State of Kuwait welcomed the holding of the Conference, as it represents a turning point for the region and for international partners in the context of the effective support for a just, lasting and comprehensive peace in the Middle East. We also welcomed the renewed commitment to find a solution on the basis of two States living side by side in peace and security.

The State of Kuwait reaffirms the need to maintain the momentum created by the Annapolis conference. We also emphasize the importance of negotiating on all tracks, including the Syrian and Lebanese tracks, in order to achieve a just, comprehensive and lasting peace in the region on the basis of resolutions of international legitimacy, the Arab Peace Initiative and the Road Map. Kuwait also stresses the importance of Israel's discussing three crucial issues in all seriousness, namely, Jerusalem, settlements and the right of return for refugees on the basis of resolution 194 (III), of 1948. The next few months will be a test of Israel's seriousness in achieving peace. The conference could provide an opportunity and some hope for a breakthrough to end the stalemate in the peace negotiations and spare the region further calamities. Perhaps the presence of Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon at the upcoming meeting of the Quartet, scheduled to be held on the margins of the donors' conference at Paris in mid-December, will provide added impetus to the peace process.

Given the environment in the Middle East, we are hopeful that negotiations will resume with a view to reaching a peaceful settlement that will lead to the security and stability that everyone in the region looks forward to. The Israeli Government must realize that security is a primary demand of and a right for all the peoples and States in the region, and not exclusively for Israel.

Such a view of the Arab-Israeli conflict is an integral part of Kuwait's comprehensive vision for the Middle East region — one that is based on stability, mutual respect and cooperation between all sides. That stability will undoubtedly require confidence-building measures, foremost among which is making the Middle East a region free of all weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons, which Israel possesses.

Mr. Al-Ansari (Qatar) (*spoke in Arabic*): At the outset, I would like to express my thanks and appreciation to the President for convening this meeting. I would like also to thank the Secretary-General for his reports (A/62/327 and A/62/344) on the situation in the Middle East. I also wish to thank the Secretariat for its preparation of the reports on the subject matter at hand. However, the substantive aspect of portraying conditions in the Middle East must include a greater degree of candour and a genuine analysis of root causes. Frankness and objectivity are the most appropriate means to address this sensitive issue.

We all want to spare the world — including the region of the Middle East — from the scourge of wars and destructive conflicts and the socio-economic devastation they produce. Finding a just solution to the Palestinian question is the best way to end the crisis in the Middle East. We therefore welcome the efforts undertaken recently by the United States to achieve a just peace based on the coexistence of two States, Palestine and Israel, living side by side. My country therefore sent a high-level delegation to the Annapolis conference, for we are keen to support every effort to achieve peace. That is especially the case, given that the goal of the conference was in line with the vision that the State of Qatar put forward when it presided over the Security Council last December. At that time, we suggested the theme of sustainable peace in the Middle East as a platform for the open debate. That meeting led to the issuance of presidential statement S/PRST/2006/51, which, in line with our position, called for the consolidation of peace in the Middle East. We are also one of the sponsors of resolution A/62/L.22 on Jerusalem, and draft resolution A/62/L.23 on the Syrian Golan. We call on all delegations to support them and to vote in favour.

Since peace in the Middle East has complementary and interrelated dimensions that affect one another, the Palestinian people must not fall victim to the historic conflict in the Middle East and the failure to achieve a just and sustainable peace in that sensitive region of the world.

Moreover, the suffering of the Arab people in the occupied Syrian Golan Heights and parts of southern Lebanon must not be forgotten, nor do we accept that the Israeli people are doomed to the same fate. Israel therefore needs to demonstrate its earnestness and political will on the path of peace and to turn words into deeds, especially given the momentum that has been generated by the Annapolis peace conference, by abjuring policies that contravene international law, undermine international conferences and initiatives and peace opportunities, and make the task of the Quartet more difficult.

Israel's persistence in its efforts to build the separation wall in occupied Palestine — contrary to the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice that was requested by the international community by virtue of a General Assembly resolution — and in taking revenge on the Palestinian people through the kidnapping, assassination and detention of leaders and legitimate representatives of the Palestinian people; its excavations under the Al-Aqsa Mosque and its vicinity, which threaten the holy sanctuaries; its targeting of Arab, including Palestinian and Lebanese, cities and villages; its demolition of houses over the heads of their occupants; and its targeting of places of worship, schools and hospitals demonstrate an unfortunate lack of understanding of the culture of peace and of the public good for the peoples of the Middle East, including the Israeli people themselves.

We regret that such violations are taking place in the context of the Security Council's failure to carry out the duty entrusted to it by the Charter and of the feeble political will to implement the resolutions of international legitimacy, embodied by the relevant Security Council resolutions, particularly resolution 242 (1967) — whereby the Security Council formulated in October 1967 the principles of achieving a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East — resolutions 338 (1973), 425 (1978) and 497 (1981); and the successive resolutions of the General Assembly, in particular resolution 194 (III) of 1948 and last year's resolutions 61/25 and 61/26, which are yet to be implemented; and many more appeals made in Security Council statements and reports of the Secretariat. All of those texts recognize the terms of reference of a just and comprehensive peace, and the legal and political obligations of Israel, including that it take practical measures to negotiate with the Arab countries affected by the conflict and to end the Israeli occupation of their territories, to which the Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Times of War is applicable under international law, as stressed by the United Nations resolutions.

Israel therefore needs to demonstrate its seriousness about peace through its full withdrawal from the occupied Syrian Golan to the line of 4 June 1967, pursuant to Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which, unfortunately, has yet to be implemented. Israel also needs to effectively withdraw from southern Lebanon. In order to achieve stability in Lebanon, it is essential that all parties respect and implement Security Council resolution 1701 (2006) without discrimination or selectiveness. One of the most flagrant violations of that resolution is the continued Israeli violation of Lebanese airspace and the ongoing occupation by Israeli troops of the Lebanese Shab'a farms and the village of Ghajar, thus undermining the credibility of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon and the ability of the Lebanese Government to extend its sovereignty over its territory.

Furthermore, the call for non-interference in Lebanese internal affairs must be a message to everyone, in accordance with the relevant Security Council resolutions and statements. States calling for non-interference must be role models in refraining from exerting political pressure aimed at pushing Lebanese sovereign issues in certain directions. The Lebanese themselves must decide on the affairs of their country without interference or influence from any quarter.

We in the Middle East feel threatened and insecure as a result of the non-adherence to the universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and Israel's failure to place its nuclear facilities under the overall supervision of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Such a state of affairs does not serve good intentions, the establishment of normal relations, or the efforts to eradicate international terrorism in all its forms and manifestations.

The challenges to peace and security in the Middle East are not confined to the classic concept of that crisis alone. The tragic situation that Iraq is currently experiencing, for reasons well known, and which affects its neighbours, requires the full support of the international community for the unity, sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Iraq, while recognizing the primary responsibility of all Iraqi leaders and factions for finding a formula for national reconciliation to achieve justice, stability and security for all Iraqis, millions of whom have fled the country while hundreds of thousands of others have been killed. We therefore stress the need to rectify the historical error committed against Iraq and its destructive negative impact on the Middle East and the global economy, to say nothing of its repercussions on security, since occupation and oppression are among the most prominent root causes of the scourge of terrorism.

Mr. Natalegawa (Indonesia): Indonesia is pleased to participate in this debate, which comes on the heels of the just-concluded international peace conference in Annapolis, Maryland. The conference of Annapolis offers the promise of re-energizing the peace process in the Middle East, which had been stalled for seven years.

We welcome the joint understanding of the leaders of Palestine and Israel at that conference. Their setting of the time frame of the end of 2008 for the peace treaty to realize the two-State solution of Palestine and Israel, living side by side in peace and security, provides a new impetus for peace in the broader region.

It is crucial that this momentum towards peace be nurtured and made irreversible. Indeed, the history of this subject cautions us that a just and comprehensive solution of the Palestinian issue is complex. In 2005, we did not succeed in meeting the target that had originally been agreed for achieving the vision of the two-State solution. We therefore hope that the new process will avoid the shortcomings of the past, and the international community needs to redouble its efforts in order to support the implementation of the peace process.

However, everything must start with the parties to the conflict. In order to ensure that this does not become another wasted opportunity, both sides must demonstrate strong commitment to peace. Both sides must also have strong discipline in the implementation of the joint understanding, including through the work of the steering committee.

For that to happen, all parties concerned should exercise restraint and refrain from any action that could undermine that effort. In that regard, it is important for Israel to halt its aggressive policies and heavy-handed militarism in Palestine. That is necessary in order to avoid counteracting the efforts to build confidence and a positive environment for peace negotiations. Indeed, more consultations on a regular basis are needed in order to address all outstanding core issues: international borders, the status of Jerusalem, Israeli settlements, and refugees. To that end, we welcome the commitment of the leaders of the two parties to meet on a biweekly basis.

Of equal importance is the commitment that there should be no piecemeal approach to resolving the outstanding core issues, and we do not need to reinvent the wheel to establish a foundation for peace. That is because the principles of sustainable and comprehensive peace recognized by numerous Security Council resolutions, including resolutions 242 (1967), 338 (1973), 1397 (2002) and 1515 (2003), continue to serve as solid ground for a just and fair settlement to the conflict in the Middle East. Those resolutions should form the foundation of our quest for sustainable peace in the region, along with the Arab peace initiative, which was endorsed by the Quartet.

It is imperative that the settlement be comprehensive. It is because the root cause of the conflict is the same: the persistent Israeli occupation of Arab land. Countless relevant resolutions of the United Nations have identified and amplified that point for decades through the principle of land for peace. Consequently, efforts to revive the peace process must include parallel Syria-Israel and Lebanon-Israel tracks. At the same time, we encourage the Palestinians, as they face this promising process, to settle their differences and speak with one voice. There can be no true peace unless there is peace at home.

Likewise, we wish to stress the importance of an all-inclusive political dialogue in Lebanon. Building transparent dialogue among all elements in the country is the key to reconciliation and democratic transformation, as provided for in the Taif Agreement. Thus, Indonesia attaches great significance to the continued consultations among the Lebanese factions to achieve consensus and break the existing political impasse. Yet, we continue to have a major concern over the daily threat to the life and economy of the Lebanese posed by the unexploded cluster munitions utilized by Israel during the 2006 conflict. A deplorable number of civilians have been injured as a result of those munitions.

It is regrettable that, despite a number of attempts by United Nations senior officials to obtain information regarding the firing data of those munitions, Israel has not yet responded to the request. In that regard, it is important for the international community to join the call by the Secretary-General in urging the Government of Israel to provide detailed data on the exact place, quantity and type of those munitions to the United Nations as soon as possible.

While we speak of the prospects of peace, it is of the utmost importance that we not neglect the present situation. The deteriorating conditions of the Palestinian people living in the occupied territories call for urgent and sustained humanitarian assistance from the international community. If we truly want to convince the people on the ground to embrace peace, that is the place to begin. In that regard, the international community can support the peace process by providing its assistance to alleviate the dire humanitarian situation of Palestinian people in the West Bank, as well as the Gaza Strip.

For that reason, we look forward to the upcoming Paris conference being organized in mid-December. Similarly, Indonesia will be cooperating with South Africa next year as co-sponsors of an Asia-Africa conference for Palestine. The focus will be on capacity-building of Palestine as one way of supporting the ongoing process and Palestinian institutions.

Finally, we are deeply hopeful that the new momentum towards peace will yield fruit. With the joint understanding reached in Annapolis, we look forward to the creation of a viable, independent and sovereign Palestinian State, living side by side in peace and security with Israel, by the end of 2008.

Mr. Hannesson (Iceland): First of all, let me thank the Secretary-General for his report, contained in document A/62/327, on the situation in the Middle East.

Iceland fully supports the ongoing bilateral talks between Prime Minister Olmert and President Abbas, and welcomes the revitalization of the Middle East peace process following the international meeting which took place in Annapolis. We strongly urge the parties to use the new momentum to move the peace process forward with the aim of reaching a comprehensive peace settlement within the time frame established. The Quartet and members of the international community must renew their efforts to actively assist and support the parties in their endeavours. While we take due note of those positive developments, we underline that they must be matched by concrete progress and confidence-building on the ground.

Iceland is deeply concerned about the continued violence in the Middle East, which has grave implications for the humanitarian situation and continues to undermine confidence-building efforts, be they in Lebanon, Iraq or Palestine. The vicious cycle of violence on both sides in Palestine must be broken for the sake of the peace process and the security of the two populations, whether they live in Gaza, Nablus or Sederot.

Iceland remains deeply concerned at the deteriorating humanitarian situation in Gaza, where the vast majority is currently dependent on food assistance from the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East and other international organizations. We call upon the Israeli authorities to ease access in and out of Gaza, both for humanitarian reasons and for commercial flows. The opening of the crossings in and out of Gaza is essential to ensure the viability of the Palestinian economy and improve the living conditions of the inhabitants. With the renewal of the peace process, ways should be sought to bring about reconciliation in order to bring Gaza back into the picture and secure the reunification of Palestinian territory, which is necessary for a sustainable peace. Furthermore, it needs to be ensured that necessary security measures do not entail collective punishment in violation of international humanitarian law.

Settlements in East Jerusalem and the West Bank are contrary to international humanitarian law, and we call upon Israel to cease all settlement activities, dismantle all the so-called illegal outposts, and comply otherwise with its obligations under international law, including humanitarian law, with respect to the alteration of the character and status of the occupied Palestinian territory, including East Jerusalem. That applies also to the construction of the wall in the occupied Palestinian territory, including East Jerusalem. In that context, we would like to recall the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legal consequences of the construction of the wall.

Progress in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is essential to achieving lasting stability and peace in the Middle East. Final status issues must be on the agenda in the upcoming negotiations. I would encourage political leaders to ensure that the will for peace among a great many people on both sides is reflected in the political process. That requires political courage and true leadership. It requires restraint when restraint is most difficult. It requires a determination to outflank the spoilers on both sides who would wish to sacrifice the real prospects of a peaceful and fulfilling life for millions to a distant mirage of some unattainable utopia.

The readiness of the international community to support the parties, including through the timely presentation of bridging proposals, is essential. In this regard I would like to call attention to Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) and the importance of equal participation of women in peace processes for achieving, maintaining and promoting sustainable peace. The international community needs to find ways to involve women in the peace process in a consistent and structured way. There already exists a forum of influential women from both sides, including international figures: the International Women's Commission for a Just and Sustainable Palestinian-Israeli Peace. We would like to use this opportunity to urge the parties as well as the Quartet to consider how the peace process can benefit from influential and effective groups like the International Women's Commission.

Mr. Shinyo (Japan): As we are all aware, after 60 long years of conflict and repeated setbacks stemming from continuing violence on the ground, we seem to have a genuine chance, for the first time since the year 2000, to advance the Middle East peace process. We all know what the outcome must be: the establishment of a Palestinian State living side-by-side with Israel in peace, security and prosperity. The question is how to accomplish it.

Japan believes that peace in the Middle East can be achieved only through negotiations between the Israelis and the Palestinians, based on such foundations as the principle of land for peace; the relevant United Nations resolutions, including Security Council resolutions 242 (1967), 338 (1973) and 1397 (2002); the previous agreements reached by the parties, including the Road Map; and the Arab Peace Initiative. We are also firmly convinced that peace in the Middle East must be a just, lasting and comprehensive peace which will lead to stability and prosperity in the region as a whole, including in Syria and Lebanon.

The Palestinians and Israelis, since the time of the Oslo Accords in 1993, have been raising and discussing all the relevant issues, such as permanent borders, Jerusalem, security arrangements, refugees and water resources, and have come up with various ideas for achieving peace. But they have not yet been able to translate these plans into reality on the ground.

Against this background, the Joint Understanding concluded by the representatives of the Government of the State of Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization was announced at the Annapolis Conference on 27 November. Both sides agreed to immediately launch good-faith bilateral negotiations and to make every effort to conclude a peace agreement before the end of 2008, resolving all outstanding issues, including all core issues, without exception. Japan wholeheartedly welcomes that development and pays the highest tribute to the initiative of President George W. Bush of the United States, as well as to the determined efforts for peace exerted by the two leaders, Prime Minister Ehud Olmert of Israel and President Mahmoud Abbas of the Palestinian Authority, and Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice of the United States, which led to this Understanding. We also appreciate the Arab countries' participation in the Conference.

Japan strongly urges both parties to accelerate their efforts to conclude a peace agreement in the near future through the measures contained in the Joint Understanding, including a steering committee, meeting of the leaders of the two parties on a biweekly basis, immediate implementation of both parties' obligations under the Road Map and a tripartite mechanism to follow up implementation.

At the same time, as we work to move forward, Japan is deeply concerned about the continued split between the West Bank and the Gaza Strip since Hamas took control of the Gaza Strip by force. There will be no Palestinian State without Gaza. It is therefore incumbent upon the international community to find ways to help the Palestinian Authority to reinstate law and order in the Gaza Strip under its legitimate authority and to involve the Palestinians, including those in the Gaza Strip, in the peace process. In this regard, we need to continue to address the socio-economic and humanitarian plight facing the Palestinians, which remains a matter of deep concern.

Japan has always believed that the achievement of the two-State solution requires enhancement of the democratic governance capabilities of the Palestinians through human resources development and the building of Government infrastructures, as well as the development of a viable and sustainable economy. The entire international community must come together to show its strong support for the peace efforts of these two dedicated leaders, in particular through the provision of assistance to the Palestinians in their endeavour to realize an independent State of their own. We believe that the donors conference to be held in Paris in mid-December and the international conference proposed by Russia to follow up the Annapolis Conference meeting will facilitate the international efforts to this end.

Japan has been making efforts for the advancement of the Middle East peace process in line with ongoing international efforts. Our efforts have included political dialogues with each of the parties concerned; assistance to the Palestinians, as a long-standing major donor, focusing on empowerment of the Palestinian people to give them hope for their future; and, last but not least, confidence-building measures among the parties.

One significant effort that Japan has recently undertaken is the initiative to create a corridor for peace and prosperity. The intent is to assist the Palestinians in developing a viable and sustainable economy of their own, which is a prerequisite for a sovereign State, through the creation of an agro-industrial park in the Jordan Valley based on regional cooperation among Israel, Jordan and the Palestinian Authority. The park will provide job opportunities for Palestinians and will export its products to the Gulf and to other countries.

During a visit to the Middle East last August, then-Foreign Minister Taro Aso hosted the second ministerial meeting on this initiative in Jericho, with the participation of Foreign Minister Livni of Israel, Mr. Erekat, head of the Negotiations Affairs Department of the Palestine Liberation Organization, and then-Foreign Minister Khatib of Jordan. The four representatives agreed to build the industrial park to the south of Jericho. We hope that efforts of this kind on the part of Japan will help to create a more constructive atmosphere of mutual trust and understanding among the parties and to positively influence the political dialogue that is taking place between Palestinian and Israeli leaders.

Another recent contribution of Japan was to host the International Media Seminar on Peace in the Middle East, co-organized by the Secretariat's Department of Public Information and United Nations University, in June this year. We strongly hope that such seminars will continue to serve as a useful platform to facilitate confidence-building by promoting dialogue between Palestinians and Israelis.

The President returned to the Chair.

In conclusion, we would like to emphasize that it is primarily the responsibility of the parties themselves to realize peace. No one can replace the parties, and the success of the negotiations depends on their efforts. Japan, for its part, remains fully committed to continuing to play a proactive role by supporting the efforts of the parties to achieve peace and by fostering the advancement of the peace process, in close cooperation with the international community.

Mr. Elamin (Sudan) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would like to pay tribute to you, Mr. President, for your enlightened guidance of our work at the present session. We hope that, when that work is completed, we shall have fulfilled the hopes and aspirations of Member States.

My delegation has been following very closely the situation in the Middle East, namely, the Israeli-Arab conflict. That conflict is at the very heart of the Palestinian question and of Israel's occupation of the Syrian Golan and parts of Lebanese territory.

With regard to the Palestinian question, previous speakers have addressed that issue under item 18 in referring to the report of the Secretary-General (A/62/344) and the report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (A/62/35). However, we asked for the floor because we wished to tell the General Assembly that we attach great importance to the question of the Middle East, which must always remain on the Assembly's agenda.

Israel continues to demonstrate contempt for international legitimacy by disregarding United Nations resolutions adopted since 1947 calling for the establishment of a Palestinian State according to the same formula used to establish the Israeli State in 1948, namely, through a United Nations resolution. Israel continues to display arrogance and intransigence by refusing to cooperate with the investigative committee established by the Secretary-General to investigate the violations committed at Beit Hanoun and the excavations undertaken by Israel around the Al-Asra Mosque in East Jerusalem in order to change the historic character of the Holy City. That is an egregious violation of international norms that has greatly increased tension and caused more violence on the local and regional levels.

Israel is pursuing its expansion by building even more settlements on the lands of the oppressed Palestinian people. At the same time, the international community remains shamefully silent. Israel is continuing to build the separation apartheid wall in flagrant violation of international norms and conventions and with total disregard for the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice and the investigative committee established by the Secretary-General for that purpose.

With regard to Israel's occupation of the Golan Heights, since 1967, we are again witnessing a violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a United Nations Member State. The occupation is also a violation of the United States Charter, which calls for non-interference in the internal affairs of other States.

Israel also continues to trample on international resolutions in that regard. It still occupies the Sheba'a farms, an integral part of Lebanon. As if that were not enough, in the summer of 2006 it launched a major military operation against Lebanon, which was yet another violation of the rights of peoples and States.

My delegation would like to reiterate the points lying at the heart of the Israeli-Arab conflict. The only way to relieve the tension in the region is to enable the Palestinians to enjoy their legitimate right to self-determination through the establishment of an independent State, with Jerusalem as its capital. Israel must also put an end to its occupation of the Syrian Golan, withdraw from Lebanese territories and respect fully the relevant resolutions of legitimacy. That is the only way to guarantee achieving stability, security and peace in the Middle East.

My delegation also attaches great importance to the situation in the brotherly country of Iraq. We support every effort aimed at stopping the bloodletting and maintaining Iraq's territorial integrity and the dignity, peace and security of its people.

The President: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on agenda item 17.

I would like to inform members that action on draft resolutions A/62/L.22 and A/62/L.23, under agenda item 17, as well as draft resolutions A/62/L.18 to A/62/L.21, under agenda item 18, will be taken together at a later date to be announced.

The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 17.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.

United Nations A/62/PV.61

General Assembly
Sixty-second session

Official Records

61st plenary meeting

Wednesday, 5 December 2007, 3 p.m.
New York

President: Mr. Kerim .... (The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia)

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Reports of the First Committee

The President: The General Assembly will now take up the reports of the First Committee on agenda items 88 to 105, 121 and 129.

I now request Mr. Dainius Baublys of Lithuania, Rapporteur of the First Committee, to introduce the reports of the First Committee in one intervention.

Mr. Baublys (Lithuania), Rapporteur of the First Committee: It gives me great pleasure to introduce to the General Assembly the reports of the First Committee on agenda items 88 to 105 and 121 and 129. Those reports are contained in documents A/62/381 through A/62/400.

In response to the General Assembly's appeal, the First Committee continued to fully utilize its existing resources and was able to conclude its work of the current session in four weeks, holding 25 formal meetings. The work of the Committee proceeded in a procedurally smooth, substantively constructive, more focused and action-oriented manner.

The First Committee had before it 50 draft resolutions and three draft decisions submitted for its consideration under various disarmament and related international security agenda items. One draft resolution with amendments was eventually withdrawn. Out of the 49 draft resolutions and three draft decisions adopted, 23 draft resolutions and one draft decision, or almost 46 per cent of all draft texts were adopted without a vote. As in previous sessions, the highest number of draft resolutions dealt with issues pertaining to weapons of mass destruction, nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation and preventing terrorists from acquiring nuclear materials. Indeed, out of the 52 drafts adopted this year, 21 draft resolutions and two draft decisions were devoted to nuclear issues — although, again, nuclear disarmament issues were divisive and eluded consensus.

The disarmament calendar for 2007, although light on substantive outcomes, has been full of activity. At different multilateral forums, Member States have addressed issues that cover many important aspects of international security and disarmament. Among other things, that included the first meeting of the Preparatory Committee for the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the successful conclusion of the work of the United Nations Group of Governmental Experts to Consider Further Steps to Enhance International Cooperation in Preventing, Combating and Eradicating the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, the Open-ended Working Group for the Fourth Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament, the panel on the fortieth anniversary of the Outer Space Treaty and the panel on the tenth anniversary of the Chemical Weapons Convention.

Turning to the session of the First Committee, several trends strongly manifested themselves. First, in their statements delegations paid more attention to the increasing concern over the dangers posed by existing

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

stockpiles of weapons in general and weapons of mass destruction in particular. Secondly, there was a renewed sense of urgency and a readiness to act with a high degree of cooperation on outstanding disarmament and related issues. While that was a result of the ongoing process by Member States to re-evaluate their positions on disarmament and security issues, it was equally rooted in a growing understanding of the imperatives for achieving substantive and tangible disarmament and non-proliferation measures.

That action-oriented approach provided a background for discussions on the entire spectrum of nuclear-weapon-related issues. Member States increasingly focused on some aspects of nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament that should be addressed on a priority basis in the immediate future. In the atmosphere of reasonable expectations that prevailed in anticipation of the 2010 Review Conference, Member States felt it was even more important to take a fresh look at nuclear disarmament in general, with a view to adopting new, innovative and daring approaches. A new draft resolution on decreasing the operational readiness of nuclear weapons systems was notable in that regard.

Several draft resolutions included recognition of the need for negative security assurances. Other draft resolutions that prominently reflected those concerns addressed the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, reducing nuclear danger, a renewed determination towards total elimination of nuclear weapons, nuclear disarmament and the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty.

A number of draft resolutions — such as those dealing with the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia, the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East, the consolidation of the regime established by the Treaty of Tlatelolco, the South-East Asia nuclear-weapon-free zone and the nuclear-weapon-free Southern Hemisphere and adjacent area — expressed wide support for the existing nuclear-weapon-free zones. There were also calls for the establishment of new zones as a step leading to a world without nuclear weapons.

Many delegations spoke of the opportunities within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament. As before, the draft resolution on the Conference was adopted without a vote. The draft resolution took note of the strong collective interest of the Conference to build on the increased level and focus of activities within the Conference through 2007 and to commence substantive work in 2008.

Member States also expressed their strong wish to break the existing stalemate over negotiations on the fissile material cut-off treaty and over the inability of the Conference on Disarmament to take up substantive issues for quite some time. Many delegations were hopeful that solutions were within reach and that the way would be paved for the possible establishment of the relevant ad hoc committees at the Conference.

As far as other weapons of mass destruction were concerned, the tenth anniversary of the entry into force of the Chemical Weapons Convention provided an occasion to express wide support for the Convention and its implementation. States also welcomed the successful outcome of the sixth Review Conference of the States Parties to the Biological Weapons Convention, its Final Declaration after a 10-year gap and decisions concerning four annual meetings and the establishment of the Implementation Support Unit for the period of 2007-2011.

While retaining its traditional aspects, regional and conventional disarmament has attained a new dimension that requires decisive actions. An unprecedented number of delegations took the floor to highlight an initiative for an arms trade treaty. Many dwelled on the issues of illicit trade in small arms and light weapons, illicit brokering and cluster munitions.

A great number of speakers reiterated the necessity to continue the implementation of the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects. The issue of international assistance and cooperation was markedly highlighted. Some States considered that the Programme of Action did not go far enough. Accordingly, calls were made to review its implementation. Most importantly, the First Committee recommended that the next biennial meeting of States to consider the national, regional and global implementation of the Programme of Action should be held from 14 to 18 July 2008 in New York.

In total, the Committee adopted eight draft resolutions pertaining to conventional weapons, including on the Convention of Certain Conventional Weapons, the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons, anti-personnel landmines, man-portable air defence systems and national legislation on arms transfers. A new draft resolution on effects of the use of armaments and ammunition containing depleted uranium was adopted, although consensus eluded it.

The First Committee also recommended the establishment, respectively, in 2009 of a group of governmental experts to continue to study existing and potential threats in the area of information security, and in 2010 of a group of governmental experts to review the operation and further development of the System for the Standardized Reporting of Military Expenditures.

Before concluding my substantive remarks, allow me again to return to the issue of terrorism. As I mentioned earlier, the Committee considered and adopted by consensus two draft resolutions addressing the prevention of acquisition by terrorists of radioactive material and sources and weapons of mass destruction. Those draft resolutions signal the Committee's general agreement that the new challenges faced by the international community call for a common response. Furthermore, they reaffirm that global threats could be addressed only through multilateral and concerted efforts.

Let me now briefly turn to the reports of the First Committee and draw the attention of delegations to some additions as well as a few technical errors that have crept into the text of the following documents. First, the draft resolution referred to in paragraph 8 of document A/62/393 should read as A/C.1/62/L.11*. Secondly, in the annex contained in document A/62/399, the meeting scheduled for Friday, 31 October, will actually take place in the morning.

At this stage, I would like to draw the Assembly's attention to the fact that there are a number of mostly editorial errors in some of the reports, which will require corrections. In order to save time, I shall not dwell on them here; they will be corrected by the Secretariat in due course.

Before concluding, I should like to pay well-deserved tribute to all delegations for their active participation in the work of the Committee and for their spirit of cooperation in the common search for a better, safer and more stable world. I should like to express special gratitude to His Excellency Mr. Paul Badji, Chairman of the First Committee, who, with his intimate knowledge of disarmament and international security matters and his outstanding diplomatic skills, led the proceedings of the Committee with vision and able leadership.

On behalf of the Committee and on my own behalf, let me also extend our sincere gratitude to the Committee's Vice-Chairmen — Mr. Ricardo Morote of Peru, Mr. Bassam Darwish of the Syrian Arab Republic and Mr. Roman Hunger of Switzerland — for their most effective contributions to the work of the Committee. I should also like to express my appreciation to Ambassador Sergio Duarte, High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, and Mr. Shaaban Muhammed Shaaban, Under-Secretary-General for General Assembly and Conference Management, for their leadership and contributions, as well as to the Secretariat staff that assisted the Committee.

Moreover, special thanks go to Mr. Jarmo Sareva, Secretary of the First Committee, whose vast experience made a significant contribution to the successful outcome of the Committee's work. After some years of absence from the First Committee, he is warmly welcomed back, although in his new capacity.

Mr. Kariyawasam (Sri Lanka), Vice-President, took the Chair.

On behalf of the delegations to the First Committee, may I also convey our genuine gratitude to Mr. Ioan Tudor, Mr. Sergei Cherniavsky, Ms. Tatyana Shestakova, Ms. Emer Herity and Mr. Timur Alasaniya and other officers of the Secretariat for their sometimes invisible but essential work, guidance and advice.

With those remarks, I submit the reports of the First Committee to the General Assembly for its consideration and approval, as contained in documents A/62/381 to A/62/400.

The Acting President: I thank the Rapporteur of the First Committee for his introduction of the reports of the Committee.

If there is no proposal under rule 66 of the rules of procedure, I shall take it that the General Assembly decides not to discuss the reports of the First Committee that are before the Assembly today.

It was so decided.

The Acting President: Statements will therefore be limited to explanations of vote.

The position of delegations regarding the recommendations of the First Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records.

May I remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, that is, either in the Committee or in plenary meeting, unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee, and that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Before we begin to take action on the recommendations contained in the reports of the First Committee, I should like to advise representatives that we are going to proceed to take decisions in the same manner as was done in the Committee, unless the Assembly is notified otherwise in advance. That means that where separate or recorded votes were taken, we will do the same. I should also hope that we may proceed to adopt without a vote those recommendations that were adopted without a vote in the First Committee.

Before proceeding further, I would like to draw the attention of members to a note by the Secretariat entitled "Situation reports of the First Committee on agenda items 88 to 105", which has been circulated as document A/C.1/62/INF/3/Rev.1. That note has been distributed desk-to-desk in the General Assembly Hall as the reference guide for action on draft resolutions and decisions recommended by the Committee in its reports. In that connection, members will find in column 2 of the note the numbers of the draft resolutions or decisions of the First Committee, with the corresponding numbers for action in the plenary in column 5 of the same note.

Agenda item 88

Reduction of military budgets

Report of the First Committee (A/62/381)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Objective information on military matters, including transparency of military expenditures". The First Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 62/13).

The Acting President: May I take it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 88?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 89

Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace

Report of the First Committee (A/62/382)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine

The draft resolution was adopted by 130 votes to 3, with 47 abstentions (resolution 62/14).

The Acting President: May I take it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 89?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 90

African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty

Report of the First Committee (A/62/383)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The First Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 62/15).

The Acting President: May I take it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 90?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 91

Consolidation of the regime established by the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco)

Report of the First Committee (A/62/384)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The First Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 62/16).

The Acting President: May I take it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 91?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 92

Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security

Report of the First Committee (A/62/385)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft decision recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. We will now take action on the draft decision. The First Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft decision was adopted.

The Acting President: May I take it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 92?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 93

Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security

Report of the First Committee (A/62/386)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

The draft resolution was adopted by 179 votes to 1 (resolution 62/17).

The Acting President: May I take it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 93?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 94

Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East

Report of the First Committee (A/62/387)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The First Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 62/18).

The Acting President: May I take it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 94?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 95

Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons

Report of the First Committee (A/62/388)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The draft resolution was adopted by 121 votes to 1, with 56 abstentions (resolution 62/19).

The Acting President: I give the floor to the representative of Australia, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote after the vote.

Mr. Hill (Australia): I actually wanted to make an explanation of vote following the adoption of the resolution under agenda item 93; but you are so efficient, Sir, that you just missed me. But the few comments that I want to make are equally relevant to the resolution just adopted.

I simply wanted to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the fact that a new Australian Government was sworn in on Monday of this week. Obviously, it has therefore not had adequate time to consider each of the draft resolutions to the depth that it would wish. It is therefore adopting the position of maintaining the position that the Australian delegation took on each of these items in the First Committee. Our votes today will therefore reflect the decisions that were taken by the previous Australian Government.

Nevertheless, the new Government has asked that I specifically draw to the attention of the General Assembly that it is a Government that is strongly interested in, and committed to, nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. That commitment will inform its approach to issues relating to international peace and security in the United Nations and other international forums.

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 95?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 96

Prevention of an arms race in outer space

Report of the First Committee (A/62/389)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Israel

The draft resolution was adopted by 178 votes to 1, with 1 abstention (resolution 62/20).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 96?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 97

Verification in all its aspects, including the role of the United Nations in the field of verification

Report of the First Committee (A/62/390)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The First Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 62/21).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 97?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 98

General and complete disarmament

Report of the First Committee (A/62/391)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it 27 draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 77 of its report and two draft decisions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 78 of the same report.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions before the voting.

Mr. Jordi-Tomás (Andorra) (*spoke in French*): The Principality of Andorra has learned of a change in its vote on draft resolution X, contained in document A/62/391, entitled "Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (Bangkok Treaty)". In the voting in the First Committee we abstained, but we shall now be voting in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. Toktonov (Kyrgyzstan): On behalf of the delegation of Kyrgyzstan, I would like to state that Kyrgyzstan, taking into account that it cannot be included in the list of sponsors at this stage of the draft resolution entitled "Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (Bangkok Treaty)", contained in document A/62/391, nevertheless expresses its full support for this draft resolution.

The Acting President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the 27 draft resolutions and two draft decisions, one by one. After all the decisions have been, taken, representatives will again have the opportunity to explain their vote.

Will delegations please turn to paragraph 77 of Section III of the report concerning the draft resolutions?

We turn first to draft resolution I, entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them". The First Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 62/22).

The Acting President: Draft resolution II is entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction". The First Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 62/23).

The Acting President: Draft resolution III is entitled "Follow-up to nuclear disarmament obligations agreed to at the 1995 and 2000 Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons".

A separate vote has been requested on the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. Is there any objection to this request?

As there is none, I shall first put to the vote the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution III, on which a separate vote has been requested. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bhutan, Burundi, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Russian Federation, Samoa

The sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution III was retained by 114 votes to 50, with 10 abstentions.

The Acting President: We will now vote on draft resolution III as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Armenia, Azerbaijan, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Samoa

Draft resolution III was adopted by 109 votes to 55, with 15 abstentions (resolution 62/24).

The Acting President: Draft resolution IV is entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments".

A separate vote has been requested on the sixth operative paragraph of draft resolution IV.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Israel, Pakistan, United States of America

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Greece

The sixth operative paragraph of draft resolution IV was retained by 165 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.

The Acting President: We will now vote on draft resolution IV as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, France, India, Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Australia, Bhutan, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Micronesia (Federated States of), Pakistan, Palau, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovenia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 156 votes to 5, with 14 abstentions (resolution 62/25).

The Acting President: We now turn to draft resolution V, entitled "National legislation on transfers of arms, military equipment and dual-use goods and technology". The First Committee adopted draft resolution V without a vote. May I take that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 62/26).

The Acting President: We now turn to draft resolution VI, entitled "Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Palau, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution VI was adopted by 123 votes to 6, with 51 abstentions (resolution 62/27).

The Acting President: We now turn to draft resolution VII, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Israel, Palau, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution VII was adopted by 175 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions (resolution 62/28).

The Acting President: Draft resolution VIII is entitled "Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Nauru

Draft resolution VIII was adopted by 179 votes to 1, with 1 abstention (resolution 62/29).

The Acting President: Draft resolution IX is entitled "Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Czech Republic, Israel, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution IX was adopted by 136 votes to 5, with 36 abstentions (resolution 62/30).

The Acting President: Draft resolution X is entitled "Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (Bangkok Treaty)". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

France, Israel, Micronesia (Federated States of), Palau, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution X was adopted by 174 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions (resolution 62/31).

The Acting President: Draft resolution XI is entitled "Reducing nuclear danger". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, China, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution XI was adopted by 117 votes to 52, with 12 abstentions (resolution 62/32).

The Acting President: Draft resolution XII is entitled "Measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction". The First Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution XII was adopted (resolution 62/33).

The Acting President: Draft resolution XIII is entitled "Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes". The First Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution XIII was adopted (resolution 62/34).

The President: Draft resolution XIV is entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas". Separate votes have been requested on the words "and South Asia" in operative paragraph 6 and on operative paragraph 6 as a whole of draft resolution XIV. As there is no objection to those requests, I shall first put to the vote the words "and South Asia" in operative paragraph 6, on which a separate, recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Bhutan, France, Israel, Marshall Islands, Myanmar, Pakistan, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The words "and South Asia" were retained by 163 votes to 1, with 9 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Pakistan advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote against.]

The Acting President: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 6 as a whole, on which a separate, recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic

Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Bhutan, France, Israel, Marshall Islands, Pakistan, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Operative paragraph 6 as a whole was retained by 163 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions.

The Acting President: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution XIV as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Bhutan, India, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Pakistan, Palau, Russian Federation

Draft resolution XIV as a whole was adopted by 169 votes to 3, with 8 abstentions (resolution 62/35).

The Acting President: Draft resolution XV is entitled "Decreasing the operational readiness of nuclear weapons systems". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Montenegro, Netherlands, Palau, Poland, Republic of Korea, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution XV was adopted by 139 votes to 3, with 36 abstentions (resolution 62/36).

The Acting President: Draft resolution XVI is entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the

Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, United States of America

Abstaining:

Bhutan, China, Cuba, France, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Pakistan

Draft resolution XVI was adopted by 170 votes to 3, with 9 abstentions (resolution 62/37).

The Acting President: Draft resolution XVII is entitled "Regional disarmament". The First Committee adopted draft resolution XVII without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XVII was adopted (resolution 62/38).

The Acting President: Draft resolution XVIII is entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Liechtenstein, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Montenegro, Republic of Korea, Romania, Serbia, Switzerland, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution XVIII was adopted by 127 votes to 27, with 27 abstentions (resolution 62/39).

The Acting President: Draft resolution XIX is entitled "Prevention of the illicit transfer and unauthorized access to and use of man-portable air defence systems". The First Committee adopted draft resolution XIX without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution XIX was adopted (resolution 62/40).

The Acting President: Draft resolution XX is entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam

Draft resolution XX was adopted by 164 votes to none, with 18 abstentions (resolution 62/41).

The Acting President: Draft resolution XXI is entitled "Nuclear disarmament". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and

Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, India, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Malta, Mauritius, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Sweden, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution XXI was adopted by 117 votes to 47, with 17 abstentions (resolution 62/42).

The Acting President: Draft resolution XXII is entitled "Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Israel

Draft resolution XXII was adopted by 179 votes to 1, with 1 abstention (resolution 62/43).

The Acting President: Draft resolution XXIII is entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Bhutan

Draft resolution XXIII was adopted by 177 votes to 1, with 1 abstention (resolution 62/44).

The Acting President: Draft resolution XXIV is entitled "Confidence-building measures in the regional and subregional context". The First Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XXIV was adopted (resolution 62/45).

The Acting President: Draft resolution XXV is entitled "Preventing the acquisition by terrorists of radioactive materials and sources". The First Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XXV was adopted (resolution 62/46).

The Acting President: Draft resolution XXVI is entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Draft resolution XXVI was adopted by 179 votes to 1 (resolution 62/47).

The Acting President: Draft resolution XXVII is entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

France, Israel

Draft resolution XXVII was adopted by 179 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions (resolution 62/48).

The Acting President: We turn now to paragraph 78 in section III of the report to take action on the two draft decisions.

Draft decision I is entitled "United Nations conference to identify appropriate ways of eliminating nuclear dangers in the context of nuclear disarmament". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Moldova, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey

Draft decision I was adopted by 133 to 3, with 43 abstentions.

The Acting President: Draft decision II is entitled "Missiles". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Denmark, France, Israel, Netherlands, Palau, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft decision II was adopted by 123 to 7, with 51 abstentions.

The Acting President: I now give the floor to delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote or position on the resolutions and decisions just adopted.

Mr. De Klerk (Netherlands): The Netherlands voted "no" on draft resolution IX contained in document A/62/391, entitled "Effects of the use of armaments and ammunitions containing depleted uranium".

We recognize the need for ongoing research on this subject and appreciate the fact that it is being discussed in the forum of the United Nations. However, the current reference in this resolution to the potential harmful effects of the use of depleted uranium munitions on human health and the environment cannot, in our view, be supported by conclusive scientific studies conducted by relevant international organizations such as the World Health Organization.

The Netherlands will closely monitor the results of ongoing and future research in this field, and we will carefully examine the views of Member States and relevant international organizations that can be expected to be given in response to the resolution just adopted. We are fully prepared to discuss the substance of any draft resolution that might be introduced next year with the sponsors of any such text.

Mr. Khammanichanh (Lao People's Democratic Republic): My delegation has taken the floor to explain its vote on resolution 62/41, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

Although the Lao People's Democratic Republic is not yet a State party to the Mine Ban Treaty, we support the humanitarian efforts undertaken within the framework of the Treaty and share the concerns of the international community regarding the impact of anti-personnel landmines. In that context, we have participated in the Treaty process, including various meetings of States parties, since the Treaty's inception.

The Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic continues to express its interest in acceding to the Treaty. However, we need additional time and resources in order to create conditions that will enable us to accede to the Convention and to meet all the conditions prescribed therein. Those conditions include, inter alia, national capacity-building and raising public awareness about the Treaty among Government officials and military personnel, as well as local officials directly or indirectly involved in the Treaty implementation process.

In that connection, we cooperated with the Canadian Government in organizing a workshop for local officials in 2004 and with the International Campaign to Ban Landmines Australia Network in convening a regional youth workshop on landmines in 2006. Furthermore, we have been cooperating with the Campaign regarding its annual report.

The major problem facing our country is unexploded ordnance (UXO). We are the most heavily bombed country in the world per capita; an 87,000-square-kilometre area of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, covering 15 out of its 17 provinces, remains contaminated by UXO. In addition to causing unacceptable harm and great suffering to civilians, the UXO problem has hampered the country's socio-economic development.

In that regard, with the support of the United Nations Development Programme, UNICEF and donor countries, a Lao People's Democratic Republic trust fund was established in 1995 and a comprehensive UXO programme was developed in 1996. Moreover, we have adopted a national strategic plan, "The Safe Path Forward for 2003-2013," which focuses on the humanitarian, social and environmental dimensions of the problem within the framework of overall socio-economic development and poverty eradication.

For those reasons, our delegation voted in favour of the resolution entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

Mr. Aly (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on resolution 62/37, under agenda item 98, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons".

My delegation voted in favour of the resolution, after having abstained in the voting in the First Committee, because we appreciate the positive spirit in which Japan has addressed disarmament issues as well as its constructive role in the United Nations and other relevant international organizations, such as the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). During the most recent General Conference of the IAEA, Japan voted in favour of applying the Agency's safeguards in, expressing its full support for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in that region. Japan stressed the need for Israel to join the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as a basis for establishing such a zone and for the application of the comprehensive safeguards regime to all States in the region, without exception. We appreciate Japan's position because it is based on respect for principle, as opposed to the double standards used by other States in addressing the issue of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East.

My delegation hopes that its change of vote will serve as a strong motive for joint action with the delegation of Japan and other delegations to improve the draft resolution before it is voted upon at the sixty-third session of the General Assembly, thus bolstering our conviction to vote in favour of it at that session.

The Acting President: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote. The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 98.

Agenda item 99

Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly

Report of the First Committee (A/62/392)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it six draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 25 of its report.

Before proceeding further, I should like to inform members that action on draft resolution IV, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa", is postponed to a later date to allow time for the review of its programme budget implications by the Fifth Committee. The Assembly will take action on draft resolution IV as soon as the report of the Fifth Committee on its programme budget implications is available.

We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I to III as well as V and VI, one by one.

We first turn to draft resolution I, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean". The First Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 62/49).

The Acting President: Draft resolution II is entitled "United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament". The First Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 62/50).

The Acting President: Draft resolution III is entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution III was adopted by 120 votes to 52, with 10 abstentions (resolution 62/51).

The Acting President: Draft resolution V is entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific." The First Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 62/52).

The Acting President: Draft resolution VI is entitled "Regional confidence-building measures, activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa". The First Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution VI was adopted (resolution 62/53).

The Acting President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 99.

Agenda item 100

Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session

Report of the First Committee (A/62/393)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it two draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 10 of its report.

I now offer the floor to the delegation of the United States for explanation of position before the Assembly takes action on draft resolutions I and II.

Mr. Murray (United States): The United States will not participate in the Assembly's action on draft resolution I under item 100, on the report of the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

The Acting President: We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I and II.

We turn first to draft resolution I, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission". The First Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 62/54).

The Acting President: Draft resolution II is entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament".

The First Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 62/55).

The Acting President: May I take it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 100?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 101

The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East

Report of the First Committee (A/62/394)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution.

A separate vote has been requested on the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. Is there any objection to this request? As there is none, I shall first put to vote the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, on which a separate vote has been requested. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Mauritius, Pakistan, Tonga

The sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution was retained by 166 votes to 3, with 6 abstentions.

The Acting President: I now put to vote the draft resolution as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Palau, United States of America

Abstaining:

Australia, Cameroon, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, India, Tonga

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 170 votes to 5, with 7 abstentions (resolution 62/56).

The Acting President: May I take it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 101?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 102

Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects

Report of the First Committee (A/62/395)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The First Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 62/57).

The Acting President: May I take it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 102?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 103

Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region

Report of the First Committee (A/62/396)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The First Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 62/58).

The Acting President: May I take it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration on agenda item 103?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 104

Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty

Report of the First Committee (A/62/397)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Colombia, India, Mauritius, Syrian Arab Republic

The draft resolution was adopted by 176 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions (resolution 62/59).

The Acting President: May I take it that is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 104?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 105

Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction

Report of the First Committee (A/62/398)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 9 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The First Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 62/60).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 105?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 121

Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly

Report of the First Committee (A/62/399)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft decision recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 5 of its report. We will now take action on the draft decision. The First Committee adopted the draft decision, entitled "Proposed programme of work and timetable of the First Committee for 2008". May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft decision was adopted.

The Acting President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 121.

Agenda item 129

Programme planning

Report of the First Committee (A/62/400)

The Acting President: May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to take note of the report of the First Committee?

It was so decided.

The Acting President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 129.

Programme of work

The Acting President: I would like to inform Members that the consideration of agenda item 119, "Commemoration of the two-hundredth anniversary of the abolition of the transatlantic slave trade", originally scheduled for Thursday, 6 December 2007, in the morning as the second item, has been postponed to Monday 17 December, in the afternoon.

I would also like to draw to the attention of members the following changes to the programme of work of the General Assembly.

On Thursday, 6 December 2007, in the morning, the Assembly will also take up the reports of the Sixth Committee; agenda item 114 (h), "Appointment of members of the Joint Inspection Unit"; the report of the Third Committee on agenda item 63, "Advancement of women"; and agenda item 114 (g), "Appointment of members of the Committee on Conferences".

On Monday 10 December, in the afternoon, the Assembly will first take up agenda items 17 and 18, "The situation in the Middle East" and "Question of Palestine", in order to take action on draft resolutions A/62/L.18 to A/62/L.23. The report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 128, "Proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009", as contained in document A/62/563, will also be considered. That concerns the Capital Master Plan.

On Monday 17 December, in the morning, the Assembly will take up agenda item 49, "Culture of peace"; agenda item 43, "Report of the Economic and Social Council"; agenda item 71, "Strengthening of the coordination of humanitarian and disaster relief assistance of the United Nations, including special economic assistance", and its sub-items (a) to (c); and agenda item 72, "Assistance to survivors of the 1994 genocide in Rwanda, particularly orphans, widows and victims of sexual violence", in order to take action on the draft resolutions under those items. The Assembly will also consider part I of the report of the Second Committee on agenda item 54, "Sustainable development".

On Monday 17 December, in the afternoon, the Assembly will take up the reports of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) and agenda item 119, "Commemoration of the two-hundredth anniversary of the abolition of the transatlantic slave trade".

On Tuesday 18 December, the reports of the Third Committee will be considered in the morning.

Those additions and changes will be reflected in the revised programme of work of the General Assembly, to be issued shortly under the symbol A/INF/62/4/Rev.2.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.

United Nations A/62/PV.62

General Assembly
Sixty-second session

Official Records

62nd plenary meeting
Thursday, 6 December 2007, 10 a.m.
New York

President: Mr. Kerim .... (The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia)

In the absence of the President, Mr. Beck (Palau), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

Reports of the Sixth Committee

The Acting President: The General Assembly will consider today the reports of the Sixth Committee on agenda items 78 to 86, 108, 121, 129, 137, 157 to 160, 162, 165 and 166.

I request the Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee, Mr. Adam Mulawarman Tugio of Indonesia, to introduce in one intervention the reports of the Sixth Committee that are before the General Assembly.

Mr. Tugio (Indonesia), Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee: Today, I have the honour to present the reports of the Sixth Committee on its work during the sixty-second session of the General Assembly. The Assembly allocated to the Committee 18 substantive and 3 procedural agenda items, organized under three headings corresponding to the priorities of the Organization, namely, "Promotion of justice and international law", "Drug control, crime prevention and combating international terrorism in all its forms and manifestations" and "Organizational, administrative and other matters". I propose to introduce to the Assembly the reports of the Sixth Committee on the various items falling under each of those three headings.

I shall first turn to the first heading, "Promotion of justice and international law", under which the Sixth Committee considered nine items and adopted 10 draft resolutions.

The report on agenda item 78, "Responsibility of States for internationally wrongful acts", is contained in document A/62/446, and the draft resolution recommended to the General Assembly for adoption is reproduced in paragraph 7 thereof.

The report on agenda item 79, "United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law", is contained in document A/62/447, and the draft resolution recommended to the General Assembly for adoption is reproduced in paragraph 7 thereof.

The report on agenda item 80, "Criminal accountability of United Nations officials and experts on mission", is contained in document A/62/448, and the draft resolution recommended to the General Assembly for adoption is reproduced in paragraph 12 thereof.

The report on agenda item 81, "Report of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law on the work of its fortieth session", is contained in document A/62/449. The Sixth Committee recommended two draft resolutions for adoption by the General Assembly, which are both reproduced in paragraph 10 of document A/62/449.

The report on agenda item 82, "Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its fifty-ninth session", is contained in document A/62/450, and the draft resolution recommended to the General

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

Assembly for adoption is reproduced in paragraph 8 thereof.

The report on agenda item 83, "Diplomatic protection", is contained in document A/62/451, and the draft resolution recommended to the General Assembly for adoption is reproduced in paragraph 7 thereof.

The report on agenda item 84, "Consideration of prevention of transboundary harm from hazardous activities and allocation of loss in the case of such harm", is contained in document A/62/452, and the draft resolution recommended to the General Assembly for adoption is reproduced in paragraph 7 thereof.

The report on agenda item 85, "Report of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization", is contained in document A/62/453, and the draft resolution recommended to the General Assembly for adoption is reproduced in paragraph 9 thereof.

Finally, the report on agenda item 86, "The rule of law at the national and international levels", is contained in document A/62/454, and the draft resolution recommended to the General Assembly for adoption is reproduced in paragraph 8 thereof.

The Sixth Committee adopted the 10 draft resolutions without a vote, and it is my hope that the General Assembly will be in a position to do the same. Allow me to note that, should the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution relating to the rule of law at the national and international levels, it would, inter alia, request the Secretary-General to provide details on the staffing and other requirements for the rule of law unit in his Executive Office without delay to the General Assembly for its consideration during the current session in accordance with the existing procedures.

I shall now turn to the second heading, "Drug control, crime prevention and combating international terrorism in all its forms and manifestations". The Sixth Committee considered agenda item 108, "Measures to eliminate international terrorism", under that heading. The relevant report is contained in document A/62/455, and the draft resolution recommended to the General Assembly for adoption is reproduced in paragraph 11 thereof.

The Sixth Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote, and it is my hope that the General Assembly will be in a position to do the same. Let me point out that, should the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution on measures to eliminate international terrorism, it would, inter alia, request the Ad Hoc Committee established pursuant to General Assembly resolution 51/210 to report to the General Assembly during the current session in the event of the completion of the draft comprehensive convention on international terrorism. As in the past, it is envisaged that the item in question will remain open in the agenda of the General Assembly.

Under the third and final heading, "Organizational, administrative and other matters", the Sixth Committee considered eight substantive and three procedural items.

First, the Sixth Committee considered agenda item 137, "Administration of justice at the United Nations". The relevant report is contained in document A/62/458, and the draft decision recommended to the General Assembly for adoption is reproduced in paragraph 11 thereof.

Secondly, the Sixth Committee considered agenda item 157, "Report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country". The relevant report is contained in document A/62/459, and the draft decision recommended to the General Assembly for adoption is reproduced in paragraph 8 thereof.

Thirdly, the Sixth Committee considered six requests for observer status in the General Assembly. It recommended that the General Assembly grant observer status to the following: the Regional Centre on Small Arms and Light Weapons in the Great Lakes Region and the Horn of Africa; the Italian-Latin American Institute; the Energy Charter Conference; the Eurasian Development Bank; the Conference on Interaction and Confidence-building Measures in Asia; and the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf. The relevant reports for each of the requests are found in documents A/62/460, A/62/461, A/62/462, A/62/463, A/62/522 and A/62/523, respectively, and the relevant draft resolutions are reproduced in paragraph 7 thereof.

The draft resolutions and the draft decision under this cluster of items were also adopted by the Sixth Committee without a vote, and it is my hope that the General Assembly will be in a position to do the same. It is worth noting that, should the General Assembly adopt the draft decision on the administration of justice at the United Nations, there is an understanding within the Sixth Committee that, in order to expedite the work of the item, the Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Administration of Justice at the United Nations will, during the current session of the Assembly, inform the Chairman of the Fifth Committee, through the President of the General Assembly, of the results of the work of the Ad Hoc Committee. That is intended to assist the Fifth Committee in making further progress on the item when it meets next year.

Finally, under this cluster, the Sixth Committee considered three procedural items: item 121, "Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly"; item 129, "Programme planning"; and item 5, "Election of the officers of the Main Committees". The report under agenda item 121, containing the provisional programme of work of the Sixth Committee at the sixty-third session, is contained in document A/62/456. The draft decision by which the General Assembly would take note of the provisional programme of work is reproduced in paragraph 7 of the report. The report on agenda item 129 is reproduced in document A/62/457 and no further action is recommended for the General Assembly to take. Furthermore, there is no report in respect of agenda item 5.

Consistent with previous practice, the election of the officers of the Sixth Committee for the sixty-third session will be taken up at a later stage in the course of the current session.

Respect for international law remains key in the conduct of international relations in the contemporary world community. International law is the foundation on which the Charter of the United Nations is firmly based. It is needless to emphasize the role of the Sixth Committee in assisting the General Assembly in the progressive development of international law and its codification. Promotion of justice and international law, drug control, crime prevention and combating international terrorism in all its forms and manifestations and organizational, administrative and other matters are essential priorities of the United Nations. In the draft resolutions and decisions that the Sixth Committee has adopted at the current session, it has sought to enhance the role of the Organization in achieving those priority areas, particularly in respect of the 12 substantive agenda items that were allocated to it by the General Assembly. The six requests for observer status in the General Assembly can only reaffirm the universality that this Organization represents.

This concludes my introduction of the reports of the Sixth Committee. Let me take this opportunity to express my gratitude to the Chairman of the Sixth Committee, His Excellency Ambassador Alexei Tulbure, for his hard work and for the commendable leadership he provided to the Committee throughout this session. I also wish to thank the other members of the Bureau, Mr. Jerzy Makarowski, Mr. Álvaro Sandoval and Mrs. Stella Kerubo Orina for their kind cooperation and support. Finally, my sincere gratitude and appreciation are due also to all representatives and colleagues for their invaluable contributions to the success of the session. I would be remiss if I failed also to express my appreciation to the Secretariat and the interpreters for their kind cooperation in facilitating the success of the Sixth Committee.

The Acting President: If there is no proposal under rule 66 of the rules of procedure, I shall take it that the General Assembly decides not to discuss the reports of the Sixth Committee, which are before the Assembly today.

It was so decided.

The Acting President: Statements will therefore be limited to explanations of vote. The positions of delegations regarding the recommendations of the Sixth Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records.

May I remind members that under paragraph 7 of decision 34/401, the General Assembly agreed that,

> "When the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, i.e., either in the Committee or in plenary meeting, unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee".

May I remind delegations that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Before we begin to take action on the recommendations contained in the reports of the Sixth Committee, I should like to advise representatives that we are going to proceed to take decisions in the same manner as was done in the Sixth Committee, unless the Secretariat is notified otherwise in advance. I should therefore hope that we may proceed to adopt without a vote those recommendations that were adopted without a vote in the Sixth Committee.

Agenda item 78

Responsibility of States for internationally wrongful acts

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/62/446)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Sixth Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 62/61).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 78?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 79

United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/62/447)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Sixth Committee adopted it without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 62/62).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 79?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 80

Criminal accountability of United Nations officials and experts on mission

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/62/448)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 12 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Sixth Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 62/63).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 80?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 81

Report of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law on the work of its fortieth session

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/62/449)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it two draft resolutions recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 10 of its report. We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I and II.

Draft resolution I is entitled "Report of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law on the work of its fortieth session". The Sixth Committee adopted draft resolution I without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 62/64).

The Acting President: Draft resolution II is entitled "Fiftieth anniversary of the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, done at New York on 10 June 1958". The Sixth Committee adopted draft resolution II without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 62/65).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 81?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 82

Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its fifty-ninth session

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/62/450)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Sixth Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 62/66).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 82?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 83

Diplomatic protection

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/62/451)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Sixth Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 62/67).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 83?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 84

Consideration of prevention of transboundary harm from hazardous activities and allocation of loss in the case of such harm

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/62/452)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Sixth Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 62/68).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 84?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 85

Report of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/62/453)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 9 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Sixth Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 62/69).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 85?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 86

The rule of law at the national and international levels

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/62/454)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Sixth Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 62/70).

The Acting President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 86.

Agenda item 108

Measures to eliminate international terrorism

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/62/455)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 11 of its report.

I give the floor to the representative of Canada.

Mr. Adsett (Canada): As colleagues know, when the draft resolution on measures to eliminate international terrorism was adopted in the Sixth Committee, the representative of Uganda took the floor after its adoption to propose that another organization — the East African Community — be added to the list of organizations in the twenty-first preambular paragraph. I subsequently received a written request from the representative of Kenya to make that addition.

On 26 November, I sent an e-mail and faxes to all missions proposing that the East African Community be added and indicating that I would make that proposal in plenary unless any delegation objected by 3 December 2007.

I have received no objection to the proposal, and it is my understanding that delegations agree to the addition of the East African Community in the twenty-first preambular paragraph. I would therefore propose that the draft resolution be amended with that addition and that it be adopted, as it was in the Sixth Committee, without a vote.

The Acting President: The representative of Canada has submitted an oral amendment to the draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 11 of its report. In accordance with rule 90 of the rules of procedure, the Assembly shall first take a decision on the amendment submitted by the representative of Canada. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt the oral amendment submitted by the representative of Canada?

It was so decided.

The Acting President: Since the oral amendment submitted by the representative of Canada has been adopted, we will now proceed to the draft resolution, as orally amended.

The General Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution, as orally amended. The Sixth Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt the draft resolution, as orally amended, without a vote?

The draft resolution, as orally amended, was adopted (resolution 62/71).

The Acting President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 108.

Agenda item 121 (*continued*)

Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/62/456)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft decision recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. We will now take action on the draft decision. The Sixth Committee adopted it. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft decision was adopted.

The Acting President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 121.

Agenda item 129 (*continued*)

Programme planning

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/62/457)

The Acting President: May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to take note of the report of the Sixth Committee?

It was so decided.

The Acting President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 129.

Agenda item 137

Administration of justice at the United Nations

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/62/458)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft decision recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 11 of its report. We will now take action on the draft decision. The Sixth Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft decision was adopted.

The Acting President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 137.

Agenda item 157

Report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/62/459)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Sixth Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 62/72).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 157?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 158

Observer status for the Regional Centre on Small Arms and Light Weapons in the Great Lakes Region and the Horn of Africa in the General Assembly

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/62/460)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Sixth Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 62/73).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 158?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 159

Observer status for the Italian-Latin American Institute in the General Assembly

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/62/461)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Sixth Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 62/74).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 159?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 160

Observer status for the Energy Charter Conference in the General Assembly

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/62/462)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Sixth Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 62/75).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 160?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 162

Observer status for the Eurasian Development Bank in the General Assembly

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/62/463)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Sixth

Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 62/76).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 162?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 165

Observer status for the Conference on Interaction and Confidence-building Measures in Asia in the General Assembly

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/62/522)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Sixth Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 62/77).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 165?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 166

Observer status for the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf in the General Assembly

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/62/523)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Sixth Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 62/78).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 166?

It was so decided.

The Acting President: The General Assembly has thus concluded its consideration of all of the reports of the Sixth Committee.

Agenda item 120

Implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations

The Acting President: It is my understanding that there is no request to consider this item at the present session. May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to defer consideration of this item to the sixty-third session and to include it in the provisional agenda of the sixty-third session?

It was so decided.

The Acting President: This concludes our consideration of agenda item 120.

Agenda item 163

Cooperation between the United Nations and the Eurasian Economic Community

Draft resolution (A/62/L.14)

The Acting President: I now give the floor to the representative of Tajikistan to introduce draft resolution A/62/L.14.

Mr. Aslov (Tajikistan) (*spoke in Russian*): On behalf of the member States of the Eurasian Economic Community — the Republic of Belarus, the Republic of Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, the Russian Federation, the Republic of Tajikistan and the Republic of Uzbekistan — and the following sponsors Armenia, Philippines, Thailand and Turkmenistan, I would like to introduce draft resolution A/62/L.14, entitled "Cooperation between the United Nations and the Eurasian Economic Community".

The Eurasian Economic Community — EURASEC — was established in accordance with the treaty signed on 10 October 2000 by the Presidents of the Republic of Belarus, the Republic of Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, the Russian Federation and the Republic of Tajikistan. The Republic of Uzbekistan joined the Community in 2006, when the former Organization of Central Asian Cooperation merged with EURASEC. The Republic of Armenia, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine have the status of observer States in EURASEC.

The treaty on the establishment of EURASEC affirms the commitment of the member States of the Community to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the generally recognized principles and norms of international law.

EURASEC has had observer status in the General Assembly since 2003, and it closely cooperates with the United Nations system in most of the basic areas of its activities, such as trade and economic development; the establishment of a customs union; energy; transport; agriculture and agro-industry; the regulation of migration, banking and finance; communication; education; health care and pharmaceutics; environmental protection and natural disasters risk reduction. Its main partners are the Economic Commission for Europe, the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

In order to strengthen the institutional framework of this interaction, EURASEC and UNDP signed a memorandum of understanding in September 2006. On 25 January 2007, the agreement on cooperation between the Inter-Parliamentary Assembly of EURASEC and the Economic Commission for Europe was signed.

Thus, as of today, favourable conditions have been created for mutually advantageous cooperation between the United Nations and EURASEC. Meanwhile, it is becoming obvious that, in order to enhance practical cooperation and coordination to address our common objectives in social and economic fields, particularly a timely achievement of the Millennium Development Goals and other internationally agreed goals, it is essential to place the relationship between the Eurasian Economic Community and the United Nations on a more systematic basis. That is the purpose of the draft resolution that is being introduced today.

The resolution also notes that strengthening cooperation between the United Nations and the Community contributes to the promotion of the purposes and principles of the United Nations and it invites other organizations, programmes and funds of the United Nations system, as well as international financial institutions, to cooperate and develop direct contacts with the Eurasian Economic Community with the purpose of undertaking joint implementation of programmes to achieve their goals.

In conclusion, I wish to express my gratitude to all those delegations that have participated in the three informal consultations and made their valuable contributions. I am convinced that the introduced draft resolution will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. Churkin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian delegation supports the statement made by Tajikistan as the president of the Eurasian Economic Community. The 2005 World Summit Outcome consolidated our understanding of the indivisible nature of peace, security and development. The outcome document also asserted that the formation of the collective approaches, which are needed to overcome modern threats and challenges, require the constant strengthening of cooperation between the United Nations and the regional and subregional organizations, based on the firm foundation of the United Nations Charter.

Currently more than 50 per cent of world trade is carried out within the context of regional trade agreements. The effective work of global mechanisms for regulating trade is inconceivable without regional integration, the success of which has a direct impact on the economic prosperity of a whole number of regions in the world. Russia actively concludes and uses regional trade agreements and develops multilateral institutions for regional economic integration aimed at mutual liberalization of trade relations.

Among the most successful regional mechanisms is the Eurasian Economic Community. In the brief period since its establishment in October 2000, just seven years ago, it has become a capable, dynamically developing and effective association with a well-developed institutional and legal basis. The Community has thus confirmed its usefulness and maturity. Moreover, the Community has become an integral element within the broad architecture of multilateral cooperation on the Eurasian continent for ensuring strong development, stability, peace and security. In that context, we wish to emphasize that the treaty on the establishment of the Community asserts the commitment of member States to the principles of the United Nations Charter, as well as the generally recognized principles and norms of international law.

The framework of the Eurasian Economic Community makes it an important partner with the United Nations in our region and establishes the need for dynamic development of cooperation between the two. In 2003 the Community was granted observer status in the General Assembly and firm links were established with the Economic Commission for Europe, the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific and the United Nations Development Programme. At the same time, the current level and format for interaction between the United Nations and the Community does not fully match the potential in region. We feel convinced that the time has come for the two to work on a more systematic basis so as to strengthen the effectiveness of their cooperation and enhance their synergistic effect in meeting their common goals in the socio-economic sphere, especially concerning the timely achievement of the Millennium Development Goals and other internationally agreed goals in the region.

We also wish to emphasize our interest in ensuring that the question of cooperation between the United Nations and the Community is included in the next report of the Secretary-General, which will be submitted to the next session of the General Assembly. For all of those reasons, the draft resolution was introduced by the delegations of Community member States and is being developed further in consultation with other United Nations Member States. We also wish to express our gratitude to all of those delegations that became sponsors of the draft resolution on that question.

We also wish to thank colleagues from other delegations who have actively participated in consultations for their constructive and positive approach in working on the draft resolution.

Mr. Shautsou (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): There is no doubt that the expansion of cooperation between the United Nations and regional and subregional organizations in various fields has helped to achieve the goals of the Organization. The draft resolution on cooperation between the United Nations and the Eurasian Economic Community is aimed to enhance the effectiveness of the work of both organizations in helping the member States of the Community to resolve the most topical problems of socio-economic and cultural development. The Eurasian Economic Community, is first and foremost, an organization for economic and social cooperation for a number of countries in the post-Soviet period, in areas such as energy, transportation, finance, health, education and environmental protection. We feel that the adoption of the draft resolution on cooperation between the two organizations will give an impetus to strengthening direct contacts between the Eurasian community and United Nations agencies in the joint implementation of projects in the socio-economic sphere.

The opportunities for interaction between the two are numerous. I will note only two. The issue of access to sources of energy is growing increasingly acute, especially for countries of the Eurasian Community. We feel that cooperation between the Community, the United Nations Environment Programme and the United Nations Development Programme holds future promise for better access to available sources of energy for the countries of the Eurasian Economic Community. We feel that an important area of cooperation is also United Nations assistance with the full integration of the member States of the Eurasian Economic Community — countries with economies in transition — into the world economy and their entry into the World Trade Organization (WTO). We hope this cooperation between the Eurasian Economic Community, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and other United Nations agencies will help to ensure the rapid inclusion of those States in the WTO.

We wish to express our gratitude to all States participating in consultations that supported the sponsors of the draft resolution.

The Acting President: In accordance with General Assembly resolution 58/84 of 9 December 2003, I now call on the observer for the Eurasian Economic Community.

Mr. Mansurov (Eurasian Economic Community) (*spoke in Russian*): Allow me to express, on behalf of the leaders of the State members of the Eurasian Economic Community (EURASEC), our hope for the consensus adoption of the draft resolution on cooperation between the United Nations and the Eurasian Economic Community. Four years ago, the Community was granted observer status in the United Nations General Assembly. In the framework of our interaction with the United Nations system, the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific and the United Nations Development Programme have become the main partners of the Eurasian Economic Community. Memoranda of understanding were signed with them in 2006 and 2007. Joint events devoted to important issues of mutual interest are regularly held with those organizations and there are exchanges of experience and contacts with experts at different levels.

Issues of central importance in the cooperation have been the rational and efficient use of fuel and energy resources, the development of international transportation infrastructure and environmental issues. In particular, we draw the attention of the international community to the problem of cleaning up deposits of uranium tailings in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan and the Semipalatinsk launching pad in Kazakhstan, as well as dealing with the Aral Sea problem. Those problems continue to be relevant.

Among the most important areas of the Community's cooperation with the United Nations is the implementation of the Almaty Programme of Action for landlocked countries, of transport development programmes and of programmes to increase the effectiveness of transit traffic between Europe and Asia. All the Community's activities are based on the principles of the United Nations Charter and other generally accepted norms of international law. I wish to stress again the adherence of the Community and its member States to those principles.

In the post-Soviet era, the main focus is undoubtedly on integrative cooperation within the framework of the Community, which is emerging as an important institution for regional interaction and a substantial element in the establishment of an effective system for ensuring stability in the region and expanding economic cooperation.

During the seven years of the Community's existence, all its member States have enjoyed steady growth in their gross domestic product, about 7 per cent per year, and their industrial and agricultural output, as well as rising wages and pensions. The Community has also helped to ensure stability in the region. During this period, commodity turnover among the States of the Community has more than doubled, amounting to more than $75 million in 2006 and around $90 million in 2007. National currency exchange rates have stabilized, and the inflation rate has declined. All of that clearly shows that the integration efforts undertaken within the framework of the Community have been effective.

We have focused consistently on the problem of overcoming poverty, on issues related to migration and energy and water resources management and on strengthening the Community's transport capacity. A number of programmes aimed at strengthening the social infrastructure have been adopted within the framework of the Community so as to ensure dignified living conditions for the 206 million people living in its member States. In particular, we have carried out a successful programme entitled "Ten Easy Steps for Ordinary People" and have taken important decisions to enhance interpersonal communication and provide opportunities to receive education and medical assistance anywhere in the Community and to travel without a visa to any of its member States. The structure of the Community is being strengthened, along with its treaty and legal foundation.

Furthermore, the Community continues to expand. For example, in 2006 Uzbekistan joined the Community as a full-fledged member. The Organization of Central Asian Cooperation became integrated into the Community, and the Eurasian Development Bank was established.

At the October meeting of the Community's Inter-State Council, the heads of member States signed important documents on the establishment of a single customs territory and a customs union for Belarus, Kazakhstan and Russia. In that regard, it was agreed that the Community's three other States, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, would accede to the customs union as soon as their economies were prepared for such a step.

We believe that priority areas for our future cooperation could include issues related to sustainable economic development, the environment, energy and water supplies and the development of science and technology, transport infrastructure, transit capacity and the labour market and a competitive private sector. We are prepared to discuss all those issues in greater detail with the relevant United Nations agencies and to share with them our proposals on each issue so that we can take the interaction between the United Nations and the Community to a qualitatively new and systemic level.

We believe that that is precisely the goal of the draft resolution to be adopted today. We are convinced that the draft resolution to be adopted today will contribute to strengthening of joint efforts to strengthen interaction in Eurasia, will contribute to socio-economic development of our members and to the well-being of our people and to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals.

New opportunities and prospects are opening up in terms of expanding our partnership circle and deepening our cooperation with international organizations. The Eurasian Economic Community, for its part, is prepared to engage in fruitful and mutually beneficial cooperation with all interested States and international organizations.

The Acting President: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item.

The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/62/L.14. I should like to announce that, since the introduction of the draft resolution, Mongolia has become a sponsor.

May I take it that the Assembly decides to adopt draft resolution A/62/L.14?

Draft resolution A/62/L.14 was adopted (resolution 62/79).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 163?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 114 (*continued*)

Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments

(h) Appointment of members of the Joint Inspection Unit

Note by the President of the General Assembly (A/62/549)

The Acting President: As indicated in document A/62/549, as a result of the resignation of Mr. Juan Luis Larrabure of Peru, the General Assembly is required, at its sixty-second session, to appoint a person to serve as a member of the Joint Inspection Unit for a full term of office. By decision 62/402 of 8 October 2007, the Assembly decided that the term of office of the person appointed to fill that vacancy would begin on 1 January 2008 and expire on 31 December 2012, in order to align the term of office with that of other inspectors.

In accordance with the procedures described in article 3, paragraph 1, of the statute of the Joint Inspection Unit and having consulted the regional group concerned, the President requested Peru to propose a candidate to replace Mr. Larrabure.

The candidate, in accordance with Assembly resolution 59/267 of 23 December 2004, should have experience in at least one of the following fields: oversight, audit, inspection, investigation, evaluation, finance, project evaluation, programme evaluation, human resources management, management, public administration, monitoring and/or programme performance, as well as knowledge of the United Nations system and its role in international relations.

As also indicated in document A/62/549, as a result of the consultations held in accordance with article 3, paragraph 2, of the statute of the Joint Inspection Unit, including consultations with the President of the Economic and Social Council and with the Secretary-General in his capacity as Chairman of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination, I submit to the Assembly the candidature of Mr. Enrique Román-Morey of Peru for appointment as a member of the Joint Inspection Unit for a five-year term of office beginning on 1 January 2008 and expiring on 31 December 2012.

May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to appoint that candidate?

It was so decided.

The Acting President: The General Assembly has thus concluded its consideration of sub-item (h) of agenda item 114.

Agenda item 63

Advancement of women

Report of the Third Committee (A/62/433 (Part I))

The Acting President: If there is no proposal under rule 66 of the rules of procedure, may I take it that the General Assembly decides not to discuss the report of the Third Committee that is before the Assembly today?

It was so decided.

The Acting President: Before we begin to take action on the recommendations contained in the report of the Third Committee, I should like to advise representatives that we are going to proceed to take a decision in the same manner as was done in the Third Committee.

I now give the floor to the representative of Cuba to speak on a point of order.

Mrs. Vargas Walter (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Our delegation would like an explanation, if possible, as to why this item is being considered today, because we understood that the item would be taken up on 18 December. Could you give us some information on that, Mr. President?

The Acting President: I am advised that this was done at the request of the Secretary of the Third Committee.

The Assembly will now take action on the draft decision, recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. The Third Committee adopted the draft decision, entitled "Term of office of the members of the Consultative Committee on the United Nations Development Fund for Women", without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft decision was adopted.

The Acting President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 63.

Agenda item 7 (*continued*)

Organization of work, adoption of the agenda and allocation of items

The Acting President: Members have just adopted the decision concerning the term of office of the members of the Consultative Committee on the United Nations Development Fund for Women. In subparagraph (b), the Assembly decided to include the item entitled "Appointment of the members of the Consultative Committee on the United Nations Development Fund for Women" in the agenda of the current session. If there is no objection, may I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to include this item as sub-item (j) of agenda item 114, that is, "Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments", in the agenda of the current session under heading I, which is "Organizational, administrative and other matters"? I see no objection.

It was so decided.

The Acting President: Given the nature of the item, may I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to consider sub-item (j) of agenda item 114 directly in plenary meeting? I see no objection.

It was so decided.

Agenda item 114 (*continued*)

Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments

(g) Appointment of members of the Committee on Conferences

The Acting President: Members will recall that, at its 52nd plenary meeting, on 15 November 2007, the General Assembly took note of the appointment by its President of Austria, China, Japan, Kenya, Tunisia and the United States of America as members of the Committee on Conferences for a period of three years, beginning on 1 January 2008.

Members will further recall that there remains one seat to be filled from among the Latin American and the Caribbean States. After consultations with the Chairman of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, the President of the General Assembly has appointed Argentina as a member of the Committee on Conferences for a period of three years beginning on 1 January 2008. May I take it that the Assembly takes note of this appointment?

It was so decided.

The Acting President: The General Assembly has concluded its consideration of sub-item (g) of agenda item 114.

The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 114.

The meeting rose at 11.15 a.m.

United Nations A/62/PV.63

General Assembly

Sixty-second session

Official Records

63rd plenary meeting
Thursday, 6 December 2007, 3 p.m.
New York

President: Mr. Kerim .... (The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia)

In the absence of the President, Mr. Mavroyiannis (Cyprus), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Agenda item 116 (*continued*)

Follow-up to the outcome of the Millennium Summit

The Acting President: The General Assembly will now resume its consideration of agenda item 116, entitled "Follow-up to the outcome of the Millennium Summit", to hold, in accordance with resolution 60/265, of 30 June 2006, a specific meeting focused on development, including an assessment of progress over the previous year.

Statement by the President

The Acting President: I have the honour to make the following statement on behalf of His Excellency Mr. Srgjan Kerim, President of the General Assembly.

> "Development is one of the three main pillars of the work of the United Nations. This morning, in the Economic and Social Council Chamber, a dialogue on development was held, with participants from academia, civil society, the United Nations system and Member States. The Deputy Secretary-General spoke about the work she is leading on behalf of the Secretary-General to improve the coherence and effectiveness of the development activities of the United Nations, including the objectives of the Africa Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) task force. Distinguished economists Professor Jagdish Bhagwati and Professor Joseph Stiglitz gave their assessments of emerging trends in the world economy that will affect all of our efforts to achieve faster progress to implement the international development goals, in particular the Millennium Development Goals by 2015. By being better informed and by engaging substantively in contemporary issues, we bolster the international standing and authority of the General Assembly.
>
> "In the globalized economy no country or company can insulate itself entirely from international risks. If a problem does happen, we need to be able to deal with it quickly to maintain confidence. The current bout of instability in financial markets demonstrates the sheer scale of global financial flows and how quickly what happens in one part of the world can affect us all. Robust global growth that is resilient to economic shocks and sustainable over the long-term is the best catalyst for development and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. In the past 30 years no country has reduced poverty without also increasing trade and national wealth.
>
> "The Millennium Development Goals and other internationally agreed development goals and the outcomes of the 2002 Conference on Financing for Development and the 2005 World Summit made an unprecedented contribution to focusing attention and action on the global fight

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

> against poverty and the promotion of human development for all. In many regions good progress has been made on some of the MDGs. However, absolute poverty rose over the past decade in sub-Saharan Africa. The most recent figures by the World Bank suggest that only a third of those countries will achieve a single MDG by 2015.
>
> "There are positive signs, though, and some countries are demonstrating that progress towards the MDGs is possible when strong Government leadership, good policies and healthy institutions are combined with adequate financial and technical support from the international community.
>
> "We must also take into account the interrelationship between the way our economies grow and the impact on the global climate and on our international development goals. Climate change is an issue of justice. It is the world's poorest who will suffer the most, yet they are least responsible for it. The United Nations Development Programme's annual *Human Development Report* warns that the world's poor face the most immediate and most severe costs of climate change, with the threat of unprecedented reversals in poverty reduction, health and education.
>
> "We now have a crucial window of opportunity. We have reached the midpoint to the target date for achieving the MDGs in 2015, and there is a real need to accelerate progress. Our ability — partner and donor countries — to deliver on our promises is a reflection of our commitment to effective multilateralism and to building greater trust among the global community. I look forward to your assessments of progress made in the previous year and what we can expect going forward. Progress is possible. Above all, we must demonstrate political will. Millions of lives quite literally hang in the balance."

I now give the floor to His Excellency Mr. Dalius Čekuolis, Permanent Representative of Lithuania and President of the Economic and Social Council.

Mr. Čekuolis (Lithuania), President of the Economic and Social Council: I am honoured to join other Member States at this year's specific meeting of the General Assembly focused on development. May I take this opportunity to make a few remarks on the results of the first Annual Ministerial Review (AMR) of the Economic and Social Council, held this year, as it relates to the overall effort to promote the achievement of the development agenda of the United Nations.

We are half way to 2015, and the AMR shows a glass at once half full and half empty. There are encouraging signs of a global decline in poverty in most parts of the world. There are also positive movements in other dimensions of poverty, such as access to education and health care. Many of the initiatives and actions promoted at United Nations conferences are yielding positive outcomes, and some of the quick-impact initiatives called for by the 2005 World Summit are producing measurable results.

Yet, many countries remain off track to meeting the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), particularly in sub-Saharan Africa. The overall picture to date shows uneven progress, both across and within countries — in many cases insufficient to achieve the agreed goals. So here is the main message of this year's Ministerial Review: the strategy for achieving the development agenda is working, but not on the scale required. The strategy must be improved and expanded to enable all to share in the success.

To that end, meeting the goals requires multisectoral approaches and combined efforts across the board. Developing countries need to sustain momentum by elaborating and implementing national development strategies that will accelerate progress, as called for at the 2005 Summit. Those strategies must be aligned with the development agenda through national efforts and with a broad-based and balanced approach to macroeconomic policies aimed at pro-poor economic growth and poverty reduction. The creation of decent jobs, especially for women and youth, is the critical link between growth and poverty reduction.

Those efforts must be supported by adequate financing within the global partnership and its framework for mutual accountability. The Monterrey Consensus identified the critical role in the development of increased official development assistance, debt relief, enabling trading conditions, technology transfer and improved global governance. There is a need to accelerate progress towards a development-friendly outcome to the trade negotiations of the Doha Round, including especially by increasing market access for the agricultural products of developing countries.

A number of critical challenges hamper the effort to eradicate poverty and hunger. The global physical environment continues to deteriorate, with increasing evidence that climate change is reaching a tipping point, with potentially devastating consequences for the world's poor. Desertification is continuing, exacerbated by extreme weather events, and the number of people newly infected with HIV remains about 4 million per year. The AMR provided a platform for discussing the impacts of those challenges and how the international community can and should respond to the threats.

The Council adopted a ministerial declaration by consensus, which highlights the issue of climate change and the decline in official development assistance during 2006. On the positive side, the declaration sends an important message that the international community is united in dealing with the obstacles and challenges to the realization of the Millennium Development Goals, first and foremost poverty and hunger. The declaration rightly recognizes that development, peace and security, and human rights are interlinked and mutually reinforcing. Nine out of ten countries with the lowest human development indicators have experienced conflict at some point since 1990. Those countries are clearly very far from achieving the goals set out in the United Nations development agenda.

When the Annual Ministerial Review considers countries emerging from conflict, its ultimate concern is how to help them get back on a path of progress towards the development goals. In my view, that basic concern should shape the Organization's overall contribution to peacebuilding and we must unite our efforts to that end. Indeed, progress in development is equally vital to advancing the United Nations pillar of peace and security.

The Ministerial Review was enriched by presentations made by ministers from Bangladesh, Barbados, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Ethiopia and Ghana. Challenges confronting both developing and developed countries in the pursuit of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the broader internationally agreed development goals by 2015 were discussed. I would like to mention five key policy messages that emerged from those discussions.

First, national development strategies are working, but not at the pace required. We need to accelerate and scale up the implementation process. Secondly, the global partnership should be made more effective in all its dimensions. Thirdly, the global economic environment should be made pro-development and pro-poor. Fourthly, monitoring the implementation of commitments and accountability should be strengthened. Finally, emerging threats — such as climate change and desertification — that hamper efforts to realize those goals should be addressed, and addressed urgently.

The high number of countries that have volunteered to be reviewed by the Council next year, including many developed countries, highlights the Council's role as a convener and as the central forum for review of development goals. Next year's voluntary presentations are a step forward, as the Council will undertake a review of countries at different stages of development and different perspectives.

The new biennial high-level Development Cooperation Forum, to be convened by the Council for the first time next year, will help to ensure that development cooperation is guided by a shared set of development goals that are owned by all stakeholders. The most valuable asset of the Development Cooperation Forum is its universal and political legitimacy, which ensures broad participation by all stakeholders in deliberations and discussions. The inclusion of civil society organizations, parliamentarians, local Government and private sector representatives provides for a unique opportunity to garner a wide range of inputs for a deepened dialogue on the international development cooperation agenda.

The challenge to the Forum will be to take advantage of such a distinctive profile by providing ample opportunities for the expression of views, priorities and analysis of developing countries, while at the same time ensuring the continued support and commitment of developed countries. By striking a balance that is agreeable to all stakeholders, facilitated by a focused and high-quality analysis, I believe that the Development Cooperation Forum can make a unique contribution to global dialogue and policy review on major development cooperation issues.

The theme of the 2008 review is "Implementing the internationally agreed goals and commitments in regard to sustainable development". The theme, which encompasses the three pillars of economic growth, social development and environmental protection, broadly covers the commitments made in that area, particularly Agenda 21, the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation and MDG 7 on environmental sustainability. It will be an important opportunity to ensure that critical issues in those three areas of sustainable development are adequately addressed. It is also an opportune occasion to adopt a more effective and coherent engagement strategy and practical steps for action.

By enabling us to make a comprehensive assessment of progress and identifying implementation gaps, the first AMR demonstrated its added value as a platform to review and define continuing challenges and, on the basis of shared experiences, to discuss the best ways to tackle those challenges. Importantly, it enabled us to bring the individual conference follow-up processes together in order to avoid duplications and ensure the coherence and integration of both policy and action. Such a result-oriented approach of the AMR, I believe, will help us in finding viable solutions to the implementation challenge.

We meet at the time of the official presentation of the United Nations development agenda. For me, as President of the Economic and Social Council, one of its most striking manifestations this year has been the emergence of a new Council as a force for propelling the effective implementation of the agenda.

The task of scaling up efforts for its implementation has never been more crucial. If we want to meet the MDGs by 2015 and realize the United Nations development agenda fully, we have to pursue those goals in an energetic and integrated manner. The World Summit provided us with new instruments, but we must work collectively and intensively to make that approach a reality. I therefore look forward to today's deliberations; in the end, I trust, we are a step closer to bridging the gap between performance and promises made to help lift billions of people out of the scourge of poverty.

Mr. Amil (Pakistan): On behalf of the Group of 77 and China, let me at the outset take this opportunity to thank the President of the General Assembly for convening this specific meeting focused on development.

We reaffirm that the General Assembly should be further strengthened as the highest intergovernmental mechanism for the formulation and appraisal of policy on matters relating to coordinated and integrated follow-up to the major United Nations conferences and summits in the economic, social and related fields.

A global economic slowdown with prospects of a possible recession is forecast in the wake of growing global imbalances, falling commodity prices and a weakened dollar. The growing sense of unease about the state of world's economy is reinforced by sudden fluctuations in international financial markets. The good news is that the economic slowdown and the interruption in global growth may not be as acute as originally anticipated because of the strength of some of the developing countries' economies, which is expected to counteract the slowdown and recession in the world economy. This reinforces the case for concerted effort towards unleashing the latent economic potential of developing countries, since economic prosperity in developed and developing countries is interdependent.

Another important lesson that we may draw from the present state of the interdependent and globalized world economy and the looming financial crisis is the growing vulnerability of developing countries to actions and/or omissions originating in the developed countries, over which they have little or no control.

Despite the strong economic performance by a number of developing countries during 2006, many countries are still caught in the trap of poverty, lacking productive capacity, dependent often on a single commodity, vulnerable to external economic turbulence and unattractive for commercially driven investment. The challenges that we face today are complex and daunting. The situation clearly calls for the redoubling of our efforts to highlight the inextricable linkages between peace and development and the central role which the United Nations can and must play in advancing the broad development agenda and in promoting a genuine and enhanced global partnership for development.

The G-77 and China have long argued for a comprehensive reform of the international financial system and its governance architecture. Such governance is currently attempted in restricted forums of the most prosperous nations. Reform must encompass liquidity creation, including Special Drawing Rights, official development assistance (ODA), debt issues, foreign direct investment and portfolio investment.

Official development assistance to developing countries, especially the most vulnerable among them, remains indispensable. Despite promises of an additional $50 billion in ODA, its decline last year and the heavy reliance on debt cancellation and restructuring are a source of serious concern. The forthcoming review of the Monterrey Conference on Financing for Development, to be held in Doha, Qatar, in 2008, will provide a valuable opportunity to evolve agreement on a comprehensive and effective approach to meet the resource requirements for the development of the developing countries.

We also need to adopt appropriate measures essential to overcome the technological gap between the developing and the developed countries. In this regard, the global intellectual property rights regime also needs to be reviewed.

The G-77 and China would have wished to use the specific meeting focused on development, as decided in resolution 60/265, to assess the progress over the previous year in the global economic situation and to make concrete recommendations on how best to avoid impending recession and economic slowdown. Furthermore, we would have liked to have this meeting at the beginning of the General Assembly session, rather than towards the end of the main part of its work. We would have preferred to convene this meeting during the general debate, when our leaders, at the highest political level, could reflect on the global economic trends and prospects, as well as assess the progress in the implementation of the goals and commitments.

An important dimension of the development role of the United Nations is in monitoring the implementation of the agreed goals and commitments by the concerned Member States, organizations and other actors. As we have stated previously, implementation remains the Achilles heel of the development cooperation efforts of the United Nations. In this context, consideration should be given to taking steps to redress this situation.

The G-77 and China will continue to work closely with our partners in a constructive and creative manner to address some of the key challenges that we face globally and, in the context of our work in the United Nations, to advance the implementation of the global development agenda.

Mr. Lemos Godinho (Portugal): I am speaking on behalf of the European Union. The candidate countries Turkey, Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the countries of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia, as well as Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova, Armenia and Georgia, align themselves with this declaration.

For the purpose of efficiency, I will shorten my oral statement. The full text is being circulated.

I would like, first of all, to express congratulations on the very interesting side event on development that took place earlier this morning.

The European Union (EU) is pleased to participate in this debate. It culminates a year-long discussion on how to focus and strengthen our efforts and resolve towards our common pursuits: the achievement of the internationally agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

The United Nations has made great strides in keeping these issues on the international agenda. The holding of the first annual ministerial review and the launching of the Development Cooperation Forum of the Economic and Social Council, the informal thematic debate of the General Assembly and the Secretary-General's high-level event on climate change, as well as the Assembly's High-level Dialogue on Financing for Development have been highlights in this year's calendar focusing on development. These events will contribute to the revitalization of the General Assembly and of the Organization as a whole and to the follow-up of the outcomes of the major United Nations conferences and summits in the economic, social and related fields.

The European Union is committed to the global partnership for development. The basis for this global partnership is, as stated in the Monterrey Consensus and as reaffirmed at the 2005 World Summit, that each country takes primary responsibility for its own development. The central role of national policies and development strategies cannot be overemphasized. The

European Union would like to take this opportunity to reaffirm its strong commitment to the internationally agreed development goals, including the MDGs, and its continued support for developing countries in the implementation of their national development strategies through a partnership that includes, on the one hand, progress towards sound policies, good governance and the rule of law and, on the other, actions on aid volume, aid effectiveness, debt relief, innovative finance mechanisms and trade. Efforts to reach those goals at all levels should be undertaken in an integrated way that promotes efficiencies and reduces duplication and unnecessary competition.

As part of the European Union's actions to implement the Monterrey Consensus, in 2002 we adopted a timetable for our member States to achieve 0.7 per cent of gross national income (GNI) for official development assistance (ODA) by 2015, with an intermediate collective target of 0.39 per cent of GNI by 2006, which we are pleased to say the European Union has since exceeded. We also committed ourselves to improve the quality and effectiveness of aid. In 2005, before the World Summit, the European Union reconfirmed its commitments and set a new intermediate collective target of 0.56 per cent of GNI for ODA by 2010. The European Union has also set new and ambitious targets for ODA for Africa. These significant efforts have led to the Union currently providing 57 per cent of global ODA.

The European Union's positions on development-related issues have been detailed extensively throughout this year. We take this opportunity to reaffirm our previously made statements in the field of development and to raise some complementary points.

Africa is at the heart of the EU development policy. That continent has great potential, as indicated by new economic and political successes over the past decade, with economic growth exceeding 5 per cent, and the New Partnership for Africa's Development and the African Peer Review Mechanism showing a vivid and growing culture of democracy and good governance.

But the continent still has its continuing problems. The lack of resources, adequate technology and effective institutions further limit the capacity of some African countries to adapt and respond to the adverse impacts of climate change, which are already and disproportionately affecting the poorest and most vulnerable countries and groups. That reality is evidenced by the fact that sub-Saharan Africa is off track to meet the MDGs. The European Union is keen to assist African countries in addressing those challenges.

In 2005, Africa received the largest part of European Union aid. Two years after the adoption of the European Union Strategy for Africa, the European Union and Africa will redefine their partnership in light of the profound transformations they experienced over the past few years. The joint Strategy, to be adopted during the second EU-Africa summit, taking place in Lisbon in just a few days on 8 to 9 December, will outline a long-term shared vision of the future of European Union-Africa relations in a globalized world.

The European Union also takes this opportunity to welcome the initiative of the Secretary-General of the Millennium Development Goals Africa Steering Group, which will try to accelerate the implementation of existing commitments. We look forward to seeing the results of the Group's work.

Health is also an essential component of the MDGs and therefore one of the main priorities of the EU development policy. In that respect, the EU is firmly committed to ensuring that, in particular, least developed countries have access to essential medicines at the lowest possible prices, in particular in their fight against HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria. The Council of the European Union recently adopted a decision accepting, on behalf of the European Community, a protocol amending the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, which makes permanent a waiver decision on compulsory licenses that allows members of the World Trade Organization (WTO) to export patented medicines to third countries with no manufacturing capacity in the pharmaceutical sector.

Trade is a powerful engine for economic growth. It is probably the external economic policy with the greatest impact on each and every developing country. The European Union strongly supports a rapid, ambitious and pro-poor completion of the Doha Development Round and EU-African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) economic partnership agreements. The EU also reaffirms its commitment to the ongoing negotiations of the Economic Partnership Agreements and to those agreements themselves as development instruments. The agreements, as WTO-compatible agreements, support regional integration and promote the gradual integration of the ACP economies into the rules-based world trading system, thereby fostering sustainable development and contributing to the overall effort to eradicate poverty and to enhance living conditions in the ACP countries. The European Union welcomes the significant progress made in those regions that are close to concluding an economic partnership agreement, and looks forward to progress in other regions as well.

The EU will continue to prioritize support to the least developed and other low-income countries to achieve more balanced global development, as per the European Consensus on Development, and will continue to promote the adoption by all developed countries of quota-free and tariff-free access for least developed countries before the end of the Doha Round.

The European Union congratulates Cape Verde on its graduation from the group of least developed countries (LDCs), which will become effective on 1 January 2008, and recognizes the challenges it faces in order to ensure continued economic growth. In accordance with our commitment to a smooth transition graduation process from LDC status, the European Union will develop a special partnership with the Republic of Cape Verde. The priorities of that plan, as defined by the Council of the European Union, will be political cooperation; cooperation in the field of good governance, security and stability, including cooperation in tackling illegal trafficking of people and drugs; cooperation aimed at sustainable development and the fight against poverty; trade liberalization and regional integration; and cooperation in the field of education, information, research, science and culture, thus promoting a knowledge-based society. Particular attention will be given to environmental aspects.

The European Union takes this opportunity to also congratulate Samoa on its approaching graduation from the list of LDCs, a landmark event that proves that, with concerted effort, developing countries are making progress in their development.

With accumulating scientific proof that climate change has detrimental effects on poverty reduction, responding to climate change is essential to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. As a frontrunner in that field and in the provision of development assistance, the European Union, in its Consensus on Development, emphasizes environment and biodiversity as key pillars of the Union's development cooperation. The European Union Development Days, an event that symbolizes the European Union's determination to enhance public awareness about development cooperation and to strengthen the effectiveness of the Union's development assistance, took place in Lisbon from 7 to 8 November and focused this year on climate change. They reaffirmed the urgency necessary to address the challenges posed by climate change to our development cooperation strategies and activities worldwide and strengthened our resolve to intensify the convergence of visions and the need for partnerships pivotal to our success in the global response to climate change.

In that context, adaptation is crucial. In view of their specific vulnerabilities and their limited capacity to adapt, we will need to step up our activities to support in particular the poorest among us, who have actually played a minor part in the creation of the problem. Adaptation to climate change needs to be part of policy investment decisions by countries, the private sector, international agencies and other relevant actors. Climate change needs to be fully integrated into strategies for poverty reduction, as well as development planning and budgeting.

That is also why the United Nations Climate Change Conference that is currently taking place in Bali is a one-time opportunity. Indeed, Bali is the crucial moment to transform all the international political momentum into deeds and advance current negotiations with a view to agreeing a new multilateral, comprehensive, coherent and effective post-2012 regime by 2009. As I have stated before in the Assembly, the Thirteenth Ordinary Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity in Bali must establish a clear road map towards the Fifteenth Meeting in Copenhagen in 2009 in order to avoid any implementation gap between the present regime and the future framework.

The European Union looks forward to 2008 as a year full of important development-related meetings and conferences. The upcoming Annual Ministerial Review and Development Cooperation Forum of the Economic and Social Council, the twelfth Conference of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the mid-term review of the Almaty Programme of Action on the special needs of landlocked developing countries, the Doha Follow-up

Conference on financing for development and the beginning of preparations for the future fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, along with important meetings that will take place outside the context of the United Nations, will further the international community's resolve and action in relation to development. The European Union notes that discussions are also under way to consider the status of implementation of the Millennium Development Goals in 2008.

In conclusion, the European Union reaffirms that development is a central goal in itself and that sustainable development includes good governance, human rights and political, economic, social and environmental aspects. The World Summit Outcome highlighted that development, peace and security and human rights are interlinked and mutually reinforcing. That vision of interconnectivity is important for all our concrete efforts with regard to sustainable development.

Mr. Al-Fayez (Saudi Arabia) (*spoke in Arabic*): The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia aligns itself with the statement made in connection with this agenda item by the representative of Pakistan on behalf of the Group of 77 and China.

Our meeting today is taking place seven years after the convening of the Millennium Summit. This is an opportunity for us to reinforce our ongoing efforts to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by the year 2015, an objective we all yearn to achieve. In that regard, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia believes in the importance of cooperation with the international community and recognizes the immense economic and social hardships faced by many developing nations. We therefore attach great importance to development issues and to supporting development efforts in developing countries. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia continues to contribute to efforts to speed up the rate of development in developing countries, especially in least developed countries. The main goal is to mitigate and eliminate extreme poverty and to assist nations facing special emergency conditions. With regard to natural disasters, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is considered a leading country in strategic response and in providing support to friendly peoples throughout the world.

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia believes that combating poverty is the primary goal for the new millennium, including assisting least developed countries by providing material and in-kind assistance to develop and upgrade infrastructure for the future of the peoples of those countries. Achieving development and eliminating poverty are both moral and humanitarian responsibilities.

As part of my Government's efforts to support poor countries in their efforts to reduce the level of poverty, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has provided support for the establishment of a special fund in the Islamic Development Bank to address the problems of poverty and its mitigation, contributing $1 billion to the fund. Saudi Arabia's assistance is provided through bilateral development cooperation with developing countries, as well as through regional and international multilateral organizations and specialized agencies. Through the Saudi Fund for Economic Development, we have provided a total of about $6.65 billion in support of 369 development projects and economic programmes in 68 countries. Saudi Arabia has consistently provided annual assistance to the United Nations Development Programme, UNICEF, the United Nations Population Fund, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, the United Nations Industrial Development Fund, the World Food Programme, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, the Arab Gulf Fund in support of United Nations relief organizations and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. With regard to the latter, Saudi Arabia has announced a contribution of $18 million for the period 2008-2010 — an average of $6 million annually. It should also be noted that we contributed $10 million to the Global Fund in the previous period. In addition, we have contributed $46 million to the World Programme for Combating River Blindness Disease.

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has provided material and in-kind support in excess of $24 billion to more than 14 international and regional development organizations, such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development, the United Nations Trust Fund for African Development, the Islamic Development Bank, the International Development

Association and the International Fund for Agricultural Development.

Saudi Arabia believes in the importance of sustainable development. We therefore pledged $300 million for that purpose at the third Summit of heads of State and Government of member countries of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), which was held in Riyadh from 16 to 17 November 2007. That pledge, which is intended to serve as seed money for research in the areas of energy and environmental climate change, attests to our seriousness in supporting international community and underscores the fact that oil can be a source for construction and development instead of dispute and conflict. It also reflects our substantive and genuine interest in addressing climate change and the protection of the environment. Saudi Arabia is continuing to pursue its policy of building bridges of dialogue between oil-producing and oil-consuming countries. Both sides must fulfil their responsibilities to developing countries and to combating poverty. To that end, OPEC has set up a special Fund for International Development. Since its establishment 30 years ago, contributions to the OPEC Fund have been used to assist more than 120 countries. That assistance was in addition to direct assistance provided to OPEC member countries.

Given the great importance we attach to sustainable development, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is considered a leading country in contributing to the achievement of the MDGs. We have more than doubled our allocation of public funds for education, health and social services.

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia would like to emphasize the central role of the United Nations, especially that of the Economic and Social Council, in supporting international cooperation and efforts to achieve the internationally agreed MDGs. We would also like to underscore the need for national ownership of development efforts by developing countries. There is also a need to strengthen the role of developing countries in global efforts related to strengthen international financing and its mechanisms, achieve universal education, improve gender equality and the empowerment of women, reduce the rate of infant mortality and improve health conditions. The success of sustainable development depends upon the international community's respect for cultural specificities and customs of developing nations and on fashioning development approaches that are appropriate to such specificities.

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia considers that efforts to reform international financial, monetary and trade systems should be undertaken by existing institutions. Additionally, transparency should be a priority when dealing with trade and financial matters in order to avoid the current turbulence in international financial markets.

Furthermore, we should build a global economic system on the basis of a new partnership between developing and developed countries, founded on cooperation and interdependence as well as on international economic relations based on justice, equality, mutual benefits, common responsibility and the need for developing nations to have their products reach the markets of developed countries.

In closing, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia would like to emphasize that we will not achieve sustainable development and the MDGs without world peace, or without attaining the equality and preserving the rights of developing countries. We need to uphold international law and legitimacy, ensure compliance with them and promote their applicability, without exception, by all countries. We also must resolve disputes and wars in this current century by diplomatic and peaceful means.

Mr. Heller (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Outcome Document of the 2005 World Summit recognized the importance of the existing relation between international migration and development, as well as the necessity to meet the challenges and opportunities resulting from migration. Given its magnitude and complexity, finding effective solutions has become a real challenge for the international community. Mexico places particular priority in this area because, in our territory, each and every one of the migratory manifestation can be found. Due to our geographic location, Mexico is a country of origin, destination, return and transit.

The dimension and characteristics taken on by the migratory phenomenon, within the framework of globalization, and the fact that these flows will continue in the future make it incumbent upon the international to analyse deeply the challenges presented by these movements of people. Today, it is clear that countries cannot continue to face migration with control and management measures that do not account of the complex causes of the phenomenon as well as its impact abroad, including the contributions made by migrants to the States in which they are located.

For this reason, Mexico has expressed in a number of bilateral, regional and multilateral forums the need to promote a new, comprehensive understanding of migration that favours an in-depth and broad understanding of the phenomenon. It would be through such an understanding that we could promote the positive contributions of migration and in which we could consider the causes and effects of the phenomenon; one in which the migrant, as a person, is placed at the heart of any migration policy or project.

It is essential to set aside partial approaches and short-term answers so as to make room for a broader perspective and long-term, comprehensive answers. In order to do this, it is essential to go beyond the management approach and to recognise that the labour markets cannot be the sole reference point for determining the range and scope of migration programmes, arrangements and policies.

This vision is of particular importance in strengthening the mechanisms for cooperation and international dialogue aimed at guaranteeing fundamental respect for the human rights, human dignity, and non-discrimination against migrants, particularly given the fact of their vulnerable situations.

Bearing this in mind, Mexico supports the proposal of creating a forum that will serve as a continuation of the discussions of the numerous aspects of the migratory phenomenon, with a comprehensive approach, great political openness and action-oriented discussions. Mexico welcomes the results of the first Global Forum on Migration and Development held in Brussels from 9 to 11 July this year and recognizes that these talks should contribute to the discussions to be held in Manila during the second Global Forum in October 2008.

Since the onset of this process, Mexico has proposed a close link between the forum and the United Nations in order to ensure greater coherence and coordination. We have highlighted the importance of enriching the debates with the participation of various actors involved in this issue.

Mexico notes with concern that the recognition of some countries of the need for and the importance of migrants in strengthening their own economies has not gone hand in hand with the recognition of their human rights and that the enjoyment of these rights should be reflected in their migratory status. Mexico believes that, in applying migratory laws and policies, States must develop and apply these policies with the full respect for the human rights of migrants and their families, regardless of their migratory status. This will preserve and protect their physical integrity as well as their life and dignity.

The growing tie between migration, security and borders worldwide must take account international law, particularly, international human rights law, in order to change the approach, which is, now, based strictly on the principle of sovereignty, a principle which alone does not resolve the underlining problems. On the contrary, it has tended to focus on the most negative aspects.

The position of Mexico is shared by a number of countries in this forum; while others have expressed their reservations with regards to substantively discussing the matter of human rights of migrants, saying that such a discussion could become politicized. In this regard, Mexico wishes to state that any measure, policy or programme on international migration that does not take account of the human rights component will be incomplete and will be inconsistent with the human rights structure that the international community has created and consolidated over the years.

Mexico urges States, and the United Nations as a whole, to ensure that discussions held on the question of migration are held within the framework of the Organization, or in forums in which the United Nations participates. These discussions must also be reflected in consistent actions, in accordance with the objectives of the Charter; actions that avoid duplication of efforts and partial approaches and which truly address this phenomenon that is and will continue to be present in an increasingly globalized world.

Finally, I wish to note that, in order to strengthen the links between the efforts of this Organization and of the Global Forum on Migration and Development, my delegation, along with other countries of Latin America, is sponsoring draft resolution A/62/L.25, which recognizes the need to establish a closer link between the United Nations and the Forum. To that end, we have suggested a series of very simple but specific measures to promote a greater exchange of information. We are convinced that this will help enrich the discussion on migration and development in both forums, and we therefore request the international community's support for this initiative.

Ms. Rodríguez Abascal (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation welcomes the convening of this plenary meeting of the Assembly focused on development. Cuba sees this as a major priority and as one of the three pillars of our Organization. My delegation associates itself fully with the statement made by the representative of Pakistan on behalf of the Group of 77 and China.

It is no secret that the United Nations development agenda is far from being effectively implemented. Poverty, hunger, marginalization and a shortage of resources continue to suffocate developing countries. The serious economic problems of the countries of the South continue to grow. In addition, they suffer from armed conflict, natural disasters, the spread of diseases and environmental deterioration. These forces are having a very negative effect on their development. The future is not at all encouraging.

The number of people without access to potable water is 1.1 billion; 2.6 billion lack sanitation services; more than 800 million are illiterate, and 115 million children do not go to primary school; 850 million people go hungry every day. One per cent of the richest people in the world possess 40 per cent of the wealth, while 50 per cent of the world's population possesses barely 1 per cent.

The debt of developing countries continues to grow at an alarming rate. Developing countries' participation in international trade continues to be very small compared to that of industrialized countries. Representing almost four fifths of the world population, developing countries account for only one third of international trade. Their marginalization has increased in international markets, and the net transfer of financial resources from the South to the North has continued, further deepening the unequal distribution of costs and benefits from this process.

If effective action is not taken — if there is no true will or political commitment to move forward with the development agenda — the development goals adopted at the major conferences and summits, including the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), will remain nothing more than a piece of paper, a lovely but unachievable dream. If we truly wish to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger, ensure universal primary education, reduce infant mortality, improve maternal health, combat HIV/AIDS and other illnesses, promote gender equality and guarantee sustainability of the environment — if we truly wish to meet these objectives, then we must set aside sometimes exculpatory political discussions, and we must move to action.

At the Millennium Summit, the then Secretary-General reaffirmed that we needed to more than double increase development assistance worldwide in the coming years, because only that would contribute to the achievement of the goals. However, despite the promises, official development assistance (ODA) has decreased and remains significantly below 0.7 per cent of gross national income. In 2006, it represented only 0.3 per cent of the gross national income of developed countries. That is a reduction of 5.1 per cent in real terms, compared to 2005 figures. And that reduction is seen despite the sleight of hand of donor countries which have factored in cancelled debts as part of their contribution to such assistance when they know that those debts are unrecoverable.

The drop in official development assistance is even more outrageous when a trillion dollars are spent worldwide on the arms race and a similar amount on advertising, and when there is an attempt to impose a consumption pattern that has nothing to do with the needs of developing countries and that, on the contrary, perpetuates underdevelopment, poverty and environmental degradation. With only 10 per cent of the resources earmarked for those activities, we could achieve the Millennium Development Goals.

On behalf of the billions of people who are not merely stark statistics, but who suffer and languish and who live day by day in poverty, victims of an unjust, unequal and criminal world economic order which has shown itself to be unsustainable, we are compelled to act.

The entire international community must now take true cognizance of the situation that developing countries continue to suffer if we want to save the human species. We hope that this session will raise consciousness and contribute to achieving tangible results for the benefit of the poorest and most severely marginalized people in the world. We will devote our best efforts to that end.

Sir John Sawers (United Kingdom): Mr. Vice-President, it is a particular pleasure to address the General Assembly with you in the Chair. Let me begin by saying that the United Kingdom associates itself with the statement delivered by my Portuguese colleague on behalf of the European Union (EU).

Development is central to my Prime Minister's vision of what the United Nations and the multilateral system are for, and no delegation can question how seriously my Government takes the issue of international development. We are now the world's second-largest donor. By 2010-2011, our overseas development assistance will increase to 0.56 per cent of gross national income, equivalent to $18 billion per year. We will thus deliver the commitments we made at the United Nations, at the European Union and at the Gleneagles Group of Eight (G-8) summit, including to double our aid to Africa. We are on track to increase our ODA to 0.7 percent of gross national income by 2013, two years ahead of the EU target. And we welcome the underlying upward trend in global aid: up 30 per cent since Monterrey in 2002.

But we should not focus on aid volumes alone. Developing countries have long argued the importance of growth and economic self-sufficiency, an aspiration that donors have not always supported as much as we should have. And no country has reduced poverty in the last 30 years without also increasing trade. So we need to deliver on the promise of the Doha trade round. We need a good deal for poor countries, and we need it now. In addition to creating trade rules that are fair and based on multilateralism, we need to equip countries to compete effectively and integrate into the global marketplace. As Professors Stiglitz and Bhagwati said this morning at the special event for the present meeting, aid for trade is an essential part of supporting global growth. That is why the United Kingdom has pledged to spend $750 million a year on aid to help developing countries build up their capacity to trade.

As we all know, the impact of climate change is felt disproportionately by poor countries. Unless we tackle climate change and assist poor countries to adapt, then we will not just fail to meet development targets but we will ensure that their future remains one of poverty.

Central to our ability to respond to the challenges of development are the multilateral institutions, which must be reformed to deal with the world in the twenty-first century. Here at the United Nations, we want to see better coherence across the whole system in order to ensure that poor countries get more results from the huge sums of money channelled through the system. We are particularly interested in learning the lessons and replicating the successes from the eight One United Nations pilots. And we agree that the World Bank and International Monetary Fund need to change the way they apply conditionality and move towards fairer governance that gives developing countries more voice.

The key to progress in all these areas is political will. In 2000, at the Millennium Summit, 189 countries declared that they would spare no effort to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). We have made some progress. But half way to 2015 we are not on track to meet our historic commitments.

On 31 July of this year, Gordon Brown, my Prime Minister, together with the Secretary-General, launched the MDG Call to Action with 14 heads of Government and 21 private sector leaders to tackle this development emergency. They agreed that no country or group of countries can address the situation alone. We need to work together — Governments, civil society, multilateral institutions, private sector, faith-based groups, cities and consumers — to form the global partnership that is called for by the eighth MDG. The United Nations should be at the centre of this effort.

In September of next year, we will be asking the global partnership to come together at the highest level at the United Nations to accelerate action towards achieving the MDGs. During the general debate — possibly on 25 September — we would like to see a top-level event that will bring the MDGs back to the centre of world leaders' and the world media's attention. By bringing together leaders from countries, businesses, civil society and religions, we hope the event will capture people's imagination and give civil society a cause around which to commit and to campaign. It will showcase recent success stories and highlight the transformative power of the private sector at increasing growth and reducing poverty. The event might highlight both where progress is being made and where significant gaps remain and much more effort is needed. And it would encourage all participants —

Government and non-governmental — to redouble their efforts and focus their attention on those gaps.

Of course, such a gathering needs to fit around the many big development meetings next year, including the Economic and Social Council Annual Ministerial Review and the Development Cooperation Forum, the President of the General Assembly's meeting on MDGs, the twelfth United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the fourth Tokyo International Conference on African Development (TICAD), the Accra High-level Forum on Aid Effectiveness and, most importantly, the Doha Conference on Financing for Development. The Call to Action on the MDGs will work alongside the objectives for each of these meetings, and also through the European Union and Group of Eight, to raise the profile of the MDGs and build momentum towards the crucial September event at the United Nations, and ultimately towards Doha at the end of the year.

Mr. Sen (India): We welcome this meeting on agenda item 116, with a special focus on development as mandated by resolution 60/265, but we feel that it would have been better if it had been held earlier in the session, so that a genuinely interactive debate could have taken place and some of the points made could have be incorporated into the various work schedules of the Second Committee.

I want to begin by mentioning a front-page story on Malawi that appeared in the New York Times in the first few days of this month. According to the story, Malawi has used fertilizer subsidies not only to become self-sufficient in food, but to become an agricultural exporter. It was able to do so by doing not what the developed world said to do, but by doing what the developed world does, namely subsidizing agriculture. In other words, very significantly, when the region as a whole was simply listening to advice given by the International Monetary Fund (IMF), among other organizations, it ended up suffering from malnutrition, famine and civil conflict. I think, therefore, that it is clear that many of the doctrines propounded by those organizations are wrong, including, for instance, the Ricardian competitive advantage. The famous example of that is the Stone Age group that lives across the river from a Bronze Age group and, specializing in its competitive advantage, uses stone implements. It must, however, emulate the Bronze Age group and its use of bronze implements in order to progress, according to this doctrine.

In other words, by doing what the developed world does and not what they say, Malawi has very clearly shown what needs to be done in developing countries for growth. That, of course, is very crucial, because, as the World Summit outcome document also clearly asserts, development is an end in itself.

I would also like to mention here some studies on civil conflicts in Africa. A study done by Easterly and others shows that seven nations that lapsed into civil conflict were under IMF programmes for 70 per cent of the time. That is why economist Frederic Clairmont speaks of the genocidal overhang of IMF structural adjustment in his book *Rise and Fall of Economic Liberalism*.

There is also a process of accumulation by dispossession. We heard this morning that the policies the United States pursued were very different from the advice given to Latin American countries or to Asian countries during the Asian economic crisis. In fact, as a result of that crisis, many assets were sold for a song, resulting, in fact, in one of the largest transfer of assets from the developing to the developed world in recent times, mostly to Japanese and Western corporations. This process can only be described as accumulation by dispossession.

The IMF gives this kind of advice because of its origins. After all, the IMF was set up following a process of geographical weighting — as was very clearly brought out by the economist Raymond Mikesell, who worked on the quotas at the conference. In his book on the Bretton Woods debates, Mikesell said that he had been asked to give predetermined weights to arrive at predetermined quotas for the "Big Four". Therefore, it is clear that a system of this type, and with such a record, is in urgent need of reform.

Here, I am glad to note that the previous speaker referred to increasing the role of developing countries in the Bretton Woods institutions and to addressing the question of voice and participation. Clearly, what has been done so far is negligible. Unless we also use the democratic principle of representation according to population so as to balance purely financial principles and unless we calculate gross national product on the basis of purchasing power parity, rather than modifying it based purely on market exchange rates, we cannot make a fundamental change in the quota system of the IMF.

Therefore, it is a matter of some regret that, in the resolutions that are being negotiated in the Second Committee, even a very modest aspiration such as a periodic review of the IMF by the United Nations is not being considered, despite, incidentally, the support of Professor Stiglitz — who spoke this morning — for such review in his book *Making Globalization Work*. The United Nations should, through this, recapture a central role in the economic agenda, because there is no other way, in practice, of doing so.

I now turn to the question of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which are very important, because they are a quantifiable vision of human dignity. But at the same time, quite clearly, they are not enough. One needs to go much further.

Incidentally, the MDGs have come precisely at a time when the United Nations has lost this central role in setting the world economic agenda; it has been taken away and given to the World Trade Organization, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. The old doctrine that did so much good for the developing world — namely, the doctrine that developing countries should have an industry, even if that industry could not compete for a long time in the world market behind adequate tariffs — has been replaced by totally free trade.

Therefore, in the context of this free trade, some basic standard of living should at least be maintained at a subsistence level, through the MDGs. That is where the danger is, if we stop at the MDGs and do not go beyond. Those institutions, of course, and the Bretton Woods institutions in particular, are very keen to speak and to advise on governance, when, as we have just seen, they are neither accountable nor democratic. So they have very little experience with the advice that they are actually giving.

Similarly, they say that unless the developing countries in Africa and elsewhere have institutions, they cannot have the modes of production. That is really turning economic logic on its head, because it is the modes of production that create institutions, not the other way around. But it is obvious that, as Mark Twain said, if you have a hammer, then all problems become nails. So I think that we need to get out of that syndrome.

Therefore, we need to go beyond the MDGs, while, of course, doing our best to ensure that the MDGs are met and that all aid, technology and financial flows are there to ensure that developing countries will reach the MDGs, because these are necessary; at least a basic dignity is necessary. But at the same time, one cannot stop short with mere palliation, rather than going on to development, with a mere tackling of the symptoms rather than the causes. That is the critical point.

Here, it is self-evident that one of the great barriers to doing that is really the intellectual property rights (IPR) regime. Those who attended this morning's event heard that regime very sharply criticized by Professor Stiglitz in particular, because the IPR regime essentially is meant to create monopolies and to prevent the transfer of technology at affordable prices, because without science and technology, there is no real development possible. As Nietzsche put it, you need the capital of spirit and will, which is knowledge, entrepreneurship, organization and innovation, and that is only possible through a technology flow.

Therefore, the IPR regime ensures that the developing world really experiences technology as a form of domination, not as an imperative of development. In the biblical phrase, one can say that they are shut out, not just from the pasture, but even from the Presence.

In that regard, it is necessary to look at what the IPR regime is doing on issues that are central to the developing world, namely biodiversity and generic medicines, because IPR regime protects neither biodiversity nor generic medicines. What really happens is bio-piracy, and seed plasma and genetic materials become private property. Once they are private property, it enables the extraction of rent from poor populations, whose practices have actually created that genetic material in the first place.

Also, in the case of generic medicines, you find that these become unaffordable, leading to a large number of deaths. Here I will even mention a page number: it is, I think, page 105 in Professor Stiglitz's book, which he mentioned this morning, that is, "Making globalization work", where he states that, through the IPR regime, "we are signing the death warrant of many thousands". In other words, it is a kind of minor genocide in itself.

Now this is evident in the work of these two well-known economists, Clairborne and Stiglitz, who speak of the IMF "overhang" and the IPR regime in terms of death and genocide. The Secretary-General has appointed Edward Luck as the Special Adviser for the Responsibility to Protect. It seems to me that the responsibility to protect that he really needs to exercise is vis-à-vis the IPR regime and the IMF. Therefore, instead of merely concentrating on international law, international affairs and writing speeches, he should probably brush up on his economics.

Here it is very crucial for the United Nations to adopt a central role and to set the economic agenda. But here again we find that even a very modest thing like setting up a committee of experts to look at what can be done with the IPR regime is very difficult through the resolutions of the Second Committee.

Incidentally, references were made to climate change. This subject also has a very great bearing on climate change, because if you are going to have affordable technologies for mitigation and especially for adaptation, it will require a modification of the IPR regime. This reminds me of the crisis of 1873, the first great depression, and the second Great Depression of 1929: even when those who had the privilege were up against catastrophe, they preferred to hang on to the privilege and even crash the system. Of course, some of them finally ended up jumping out of Wall Street windows. But this is really what transpired. The impact on sustainable development of the kind of globalization and the kind of IPR regime that sustains it and that we have is obvious, because there is a study by climate scientists, by Miles and Novacek, called "Biodiversity lost", in which they have calculated that the age of globalization is responsible for the mass extinction of more species than any previous age in the Earth's history, with the possible exception of the dinosaurs.

Unless the United Nations really takes this seriously, what we have is simply two things. First, we go to the morning meetings and listen to Professor Stiglitz with great attention and applaud him and then, that is about it. Secondly, we have this hypnotic spell of "the consensus of the lowest common denominator", with the result being that nothing really gets done.

It is a somewhat depressing thing, and that is why I said that we should really have this debate somewhere near the beginning of the session, so that we can listen to some of those who spoke this morning, draw certain conclusions and then try to take some corrective action, unless we believe in words alone and not in deeds.

Reference has also been made to official development assistance (ODA), and here again I would cite another Nobel Prize-winning author, the Nordic economist, Jan Tinbergen, who said that ODA should be more than 1 per cent of gross domestic product to make a difference. Certainly, the ODA level we have today is 0.33 per cent, still short of 0.7 per cent, and not all countries would meet that target.

The second problem is, of course, that the composition of ODA itself is mostly for debt relief and disaster relief. The composition itself prevents the kind of flow that is required for the kind of industrial and technological development necessary to get countries out of poverty.

In any case, there is no question of any private investment in the social infrastructure and the social sector because private investment is very peculiar. The paradox is that private investment completely disregards the market when it comes to the social sector. Surely the market demand is very clear: we need more doctors for smaller groups of patients and more teachers for smaller groups of students. In other words, the market demand in education and health is quite clearly labour-intensive. But when it comes to private flows, you do not find a response to this kind of market demand. Therefore, it is doubly important for ODA to go into the fundamental industrial, technological and social sectors.

Through South-South cooperation, India and other countries are doing what they can in terms of the transfer of science and technology, in terms of the actual financial help and in terms of generic medicines vis-à-vis our neighbourhood and vis-à-vis other developing countries in Africa and elsewhere. But it is really the developed world that can make a real difference here. The logic of what I have said is fairly clear. It is for the developed world to do this, beginning at least by trying to do it in the United Nations itself, which so far, I am afraid, is not the case, including in the Second Committee.

There has been some talk of debt. The debt trap also is in a sense accumulation by dispossession, because from 1980 to 2006 developing countries paid $7.7 trillion in debt service. During that period, their debt actually increased from $618 billion in 1980 to

$3.25 trillion in 2006. In other words, the debt servicing burden increased from 2.8 per cent of GDP in 1980 to about 5.4 per cent of GDP in 2006.

Regarding trade and the Doha Development Round, we heard a very pessimistic assessment this morning. It is true that it has ceased to be developmental. It is round in the sense of going round and round in circles, but it is not really getting us anywhere in the developing world. Quite clearly, unless there is action in eliminating agricultural subsidies, the subsistence farmers of the developing world cannot be exposed to this flood, not of products, but rather a flood of subsidies. Similarly, unless there is progress on agriculture, the developing countries cannot really assure their position on non-agricultural market access.

In any case, regarding such access, instead of less than full reciprocity, there is more than full reciprocity through the Swiss coefficients formula. Therefore, I think that, whether it be trade, aid, ODA, debt relief, the Bretton Woods institutions or the intellectual property rights regime, the cards that are being dealt to the developing world are extremely difficult.

I do not want to take too much more time; I think I have covered the essential features. But before I conclude, I would like to at least say that the Economic and Social Council could also play a role — through the strengthening of the Council; through the Development Cooperation Forum in terms of actually overseeing international development cooperation; and through the Annual Ministerial Review in terms of concentrating on the development partnership and not just on the MDGs.

Without this, the situation in the world will go in extremely adverse directions. There is one figure which I will cite, which I think is very telling in terms of the inequalities in the world today. During the time of the first depression to which I referred, in 1873 — which was the time of the Franco-Prussian War and the Paris Commune — the ratio of the average per capita income to the income of the poorest was 11 to 1. Now, it is 67 to 1. So much for the enormous advance that has been made in terms of the development of the poorest and in terms of a more stable and socially more cohesive world order.

Of course, we can continue as we are continuing in the various resolutions which we happily adopt by consensus and which do not really mean very much or do anything. But unfortunately, because of climate change and because of social discontent, the sky will continue to become darker, the seas will continue to rise higher and the hurricanes will continue to gather greater force. And ultimately, if I may be permitted to use a phrase of the great Latin American liberator Simón Bolívar, the United Nations itself will be like a feather carried by the tempest — and equally irrelevant.

I will conclude with an appeal that, at least at the next session of the General Assembly, we look at some of these issues and see what the United Nations can actually do about them, rather than simply listening to Professor Stiglitz and then going about our business as usual.

Mr. Al-Khater (Qatar) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation wishes to thank the President for this opportunity to participate in the debate on item 116, "Follow-up to the outcome of the Millennium Summit: specific meeting focused on development". We support the statement made by the representative of Pakistan on behalf of the Group of 77 and China.

Today's meeting is intended to follow up the Millennium Summit outcome, both by evaluating progress in realizing the Summit outcome and by reviewing the partnership in that respect. The activities of the United Nations should figure prominently in the field of development. The mandate and main functions of the United Nations, in accordance with the principles and purposes of the Charter, are not limited to peace and security operations. The Organization should focus on social and economic development, because without development it is difficult to ensure peace and security. We cannot enjoy development without security, or security without development.

Collective security is linked to social solidarity. Proceeding from this and since development is one of the most important issues, sincere international cooperation between developed and developing countries is needed. Despite the progress achieved in many aspects of international cooperation, there are those who feel that the international community is threatened by hunger, poverty and disease — including AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis — which have reached frightening levels. Half of the world population lives on less than one dollar per day.

At the Millennium Summit, we acknowledged that despite the lofty principles of the United Nations, many people are still suffering as a result of war, disease and the lack of basic necessities. Many live in abject poverty and extreme deprivation We acknowledged also that in order to grapple with those problems, partnerships are needed in order to achieve our common goals. We resolved to combat poverty and to reduce it by half by 2015. We also called for ensuring that globalization benefits all, in a world characterized by justice and equity. The objective of achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) figures prominently in our efforts to achieve the broader goals of development in order to ensure that all may live in a world where justice, equity and security prevail.

The United Nations must strengthen itself in order to face the renewed challenges standing in the way of international partnerships for development. United Nations reports indicate that the current world economic situation is conducive to the attainment of the MDGs. The reports tell us that the annual world growth has reached about 5 per cent. Inflation is modest, and financial stability has improved compared with recent decades. Gross domestic product (GDP) is rising in many parts of the world. Similar progress is expected next year.

We are now halfway between the adoption of the MDGs in 2000 and the 2015 target for achieving them. Yet the United Nations *Millennium Development Goals Report 2007* tells us of severe shortfalls in sub-Saharan Africa with respect to achieving any of the Goals. Despite the numerous goals achieved in several areas and the fact that others are indeed achievable, many countries — including African countries with the best statesmanship — have not been able to combat all aspects of abject poverty. Although the percentage of people living on less than $1 per day has decreased somewhat, in order to achieve the level identified by the MDGs by 2015 it will be necessary to double the current pace of MDG implementation.

With regard to the environment, only 42 per cent of people living in rural areas have access to drinking water and 63 per cent of the world's people lack adequate sanitary facilities. Although the number of people in Africa suffering from extreme poverty has increased, growth in many countries has in the last three years exceeded 6 per cent per annum and is expected to reach 7 per cent.

The United Nations statistics to which I have referred point to continued fragility. Progress depends upon a breakthrough in the price of basic commodities. We require effective partnership and cooperation in many areas. In that regard, efforts should be coupled with increased undertakings to augment official development assistance.

Mr. Tarragô (Brazil): At the outset, we associate ourselves with the statement made by the representative of Pakistan on behalf of the Group of 77 and China.

The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) are not merely about statistics but, first and foremost, about individuals and the improvement of the living standards of entire populations. To lift hundreds of millions of people out of poverty and to provide access to education and health to all are the greatest challenges for international cooperation and the United Nations. The successful achievement of the MDGs will shape the world of many generations to come.

For that reason, we believe that the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals should be constantly reviewed. Such stocktaking cannot be static, nor can it be exclusively backward-looking. In fact, such an exercise only makes sense if all parties involved identify the main factors that contribute to either advancing or hindering the achievement of the MDGs.

Much has been said about the importance of factors that play a crucial role in the achievement of the MDGs, including trade, official development assistance (ODA), debt alleviation, foreign direct investment and international cooperation. My intention today is to highlight some aspects to which Brazil believes particular attention should be paid.

First, we share the view that development is the responsibility of countries themselves. Public policies are of the essence to spur economic growth, lessen income inequality and combat poverty. In many developing countries, specially designed policies have been put in place since 2001 to improve income distribution, in the form of transfer-of-income programmes. A successful experience in Brazil is the Bolsa Familia project, which grants monthly allowances to 11 million families. We were pleased to learn that macroeconomic stability and growth, combined with income distribution, has led to a significant reduction of poverty in many developing countries.

But domestic public policies to promote development do not stand alone; they depend upon a favourable international environment. National responsibility for development does not preclude the central role of ODA and other traditional mechanisms to promote development. In our view, trade and international cooperation should support national efforts.

Where trade is concerned, our view is that meaningful progress in agricultural trade holds the key to poverty reduction in the developing world. The Brazilian Government has been fully committed to help the Doha Round to move forward and to live up to the high expectations placed on its development objectives. Nevertheless, agreement will only be reached if some developed partners overcome paralysis and display a genuine commitment to address the main distortions that plague the world's agricultural trade.

The increasingly important South-South trade is also part of international efforts to make trade a genuine tool for development. It is important that South-South cooperation be mainstreamed in development issues, while preserving its unique position in international cooperation. South-South initiatives, such as in the area of technical cooperation, make an important contribution to national development efforts. Partnerships between countries of the South, including through triangular initiatives, are becoming more relevant, as attested by the initiative launched by India, Brazil and South Africa.

In recent months the world economy has gone through financial turbulence, which demonstrates the harmful potential of excessive liquidity and the complacency shown in the face of the distortions that exist in the financial markets of the main economies. Developing countries, whose economic growth has contributed to compensating for the deceleration in global growth, are the most vulnerable ones in the current scenario. On the one hand, short-term flows constrain the sovereign power of setting interest rates according to broader macroeconomic goals of employment, economic growth and inflation. On the other hand, foreign direct investment, although more stable and long term in nature, is excessively concentrated in five major developing economies and in a few sectors. The lack of foreign direct investment is especially noticeable in infrastructure investments. Unfortunately, the world economy will be vulnerable to turbulence for as long as an irrational architecture prevails in which developing countries finance developed ones by massive transfers of funds.

Financial turbulence sheds light on the issue of the voice and participation of developing and transition countries in the decision-making process at the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund — one of the main pending issues of the Monterrey Consensus. Real change in the representation and effectiveness of the Bretton Woods institutions depends on a new, simple and transparent quota formula that has gross domestic product as its natural cornerstone.

I have tried to sketch some features of national and international efforts that can play a decisive role in achieving the MDGs. Our efforts must be constantly kept under review, so as to ensure that cooperation will not falter in our quest to improve the living standards of developing countries. That is why my Government supports the proposal made by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom — the so-called call to action — to hold a summit meeting in 2008 to review the implementation of the MDGs. We hope that next year's stocktaking will strengthen global partnership and help translate globalization into a concerted move towards a world free of poverty.

Mr. Liu Zhenmin (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The delegation of China associates itself with the statement made by the representative of Pakistan on behalf of the Group of 77 and China.

It is the common aspiration of the international community to achieve balanced, coordinated and sustainable development around the globe. Since the 1990s, a series of important international conferences and summits on development have been convened and important consensus has been reached. In 2000, the Millennium Summit identified the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), setting forth the road map and timetable for international cooperation on development for the next 15 years. The 2005 World Summit adopted an Outcome Document (resolution 60/1), setting out, in a comprehensive and in-depth way, actions that need to be taken by all parties, thus further heightening the political commitment to promote development through cooperation.

The world has seen continued economic growth, creation of new wealth and advances in science and technology. These are welcomed developments. What is disturbing, however, is that the gaps among nations and between rich and poor are widening, and many developing countries, instead of embarking on the fast track of globalization, are being marginalized and plunged into the poverty trap. This year marks the midpoint of the implementation of the MDGs and the fifth anniversary of the International Conference on Financing for Development. As things stand now, the status of the implementation of the MDGs gives us no reason for optimism and that of the Monterrey Consensus is also not satisfactory.

The good momentum in the area of development we have witnessed since the 2005 World Summit is vanishing. In 2006, official development assistance from developed countries fell, rather than increasing. If this trend is not reversed immediately, the unity and mutual trust between North and South in seeking development through cooperation will be eroded, and the achievement of the MDGs will undoubtedly be delayed.

The international community should act with a strong sense of urgency and mission, take effective measures to follow through on the existing consensus and commitments, redress the imbalances in development and speed up the implementation of the MDGs and other internationally agreed development goals.

The Chinese side believes that emphasis should be put on the following five areas. First of all, adjustment and innovation are tasks facing all countries. In a rapidly changing world, the notion of development needs to be constantly updated. It is crucial for countries to draw up and implement development strategies suited to their national conditions. Reform and innovation are always necessary if a country is to be better able to face up to pressure and challenges, survive competition and achieve development. Developing countries have engaged themselves in the process of globalization and have made initial progress in independently formulating and implementing development strategies. The international community should take full account of the special needs of developing countries, leave enough policy space for those countries in making the rules of the game and create a favourable institutional environment for their development.

Secondly, the issue of development should be resolved in a comprehensive manner by the joint efforts of all interrelated parties. In the process of economic globalization, countries are more and more interdependent, with increasing flows of capital, trade and people. The international consensus should be implemented through various channels and in various ways to ensure lasting development across the board. International consensus reached at major international conferences and summits concerning capital, trade, technology and debt should be implemented in good faith. Developed countries need to take comprehensive and effective measures to help developing countries through increased assistance, debt relief, the opening of markets and transfer of technology, so as to ensure that growth of financial resources and improvement of effectiveness go hand in hand.

Thirdly, climate change is a pressing challenge facing all countries. For developing countries, climate change will no doubt affect the realization of the MDGs. However, it does no good for the sustainable development of developing countries if those countries are forced to shoulder the responsibility of reducing emissions in disregard of the fact that their development is still at a low level. What is important is for the international community to reach consensus on the issue and turn the effort to tackle climate change into an opportunity for accelerating development, rather than an obstacle to sustainable development. To that end, the international community needs to formulate specific plans under the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities. In particular, it should provide new and additional funds to developing countries, transfer environment-friendly technologies and help developing countries strengthen capacity-building to effectively respond to climate change.

Fourthly, South-South cooperation should play an important complementary role. South-South cooperation is diverse in its forms, offers great potential and has made considerable progress in recent years. Developing countries are enthusiastic about their mutually beneficial economic and technological cooperation, which has injected great vitality into South-South cooperation. The international community should encourage and support South-South cooperation. On the other hand, expectations for South-South cooperation should not be too high. In particular, developing country participants should not be treated in the same light as donor countries from the developed world.

Fifthly, the international economic regime should be further improved. To ensure that the benefits of globalization are shared by all countries, developing countries in particular, it is essential to increase the voice and participation of developing countries in international finance and trade systems. Reform of the international financial regime should take full account of the needs of developing countries, reflect changes in the international economic landscape and increase the representation of developing countries. The Doha Round negotiations should be promoted to achieve the goal of making them a development round. It is also necessary to oppose trade protectionism and to work towards the establishment and development of an open, fair and just multilateral trading system.

While focusing on its own development, China values international cooperation in the field of development and seeks coordinated and balanced development. Although China is still a developing country, it has provided assistance to many other developing countries, to the best of its ability, to help them improve their capacity for independent development. Recent years have witnessed remarkable progress in economic and technological cooperation between China and other developing countries, as evidenced by an expansion in investment and trade. There is a marked increase in China's economic and technological support to least developed countries. China and other developing countries are making further efforts to build on our strengths, tap our potential, explore new approaches and ways of engaging in cooperation and learn from each other to make a greater contribution to common development.

At the Beijing Summit of the Forum on China-Africa Cooperation, held last year, President Hu Jintao announced, on behalf of the Chinese Government, eight policy measures to strengthen practical cooperation between China and Africa and to support the development of African nations. Thanks to the joint efforts of both sides, the eight policy measures are being implemented across the board. China is about to fulfil its commitment to Africa in development assistance and debt and tariff relief; the foundation stone has been laid for the African Union Convention Centre; the China-Africa Development Fund has been launched successfully; efforts to help African countries build hospitals, demonstration centres and rural schools as well as to strengthen agricultural technology, are in full swing and are making significant progress.

Economic and trade cooperation zones are being built by China in countries concerned. This year, China has trained more than 3,600 professionals for African countries. The two sides have made new breakthroughs in cooperation in finance, science and technology, civil aviation and other fields. From January to July, China-Africa trade stood at $39.3 billion, an increase of nearly 30 per cent compared with the same period last year.

It is the common responsibility of all countries to implement the outcomes of major United Nations conferences and summits in the field of development. In that connection, the Chinese Government stands ready to strengthen cooperation and share best practices and success stories with the rest of the international community to work for a harmonious world of lasting peace and common prosperity.

The Acting President: We have heard the last speaker in this specific meeting focused on development. The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 116.

Organization of work

The Acting President: Before concluding our meeting, I would like to inform members that on Monday, 10 December 2007, in the afternoon, the Assembly will also take up the report of the Second Committee contained in document A/62/419/Add.4, under sub-item (d) of agenda item 54, entitled "Protection of global climate for present and future generations of mankind".

I should like to consult members regarding a further extension for the work of the Second Committee. Members will recall that, at its 59th plenary meeting, on 30 November 2007, the General Assembly agreed to an extension for the work of the Second Committee until Friday, 7 December 2007. Subsequently, the President of the Assembly was further informed by the Chairperson of the Second Committee that the Committee would not be able to finish its work until Friday, 14 December 2007. May I therefore take it that the General Assembly agrees to extend the work of the Second Committee until 14 December 2007?

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.